

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXVI.

JULY, 1891.

MY VIEWS ON PHILANTHROPY.

BY THE BARON DE HIRSCH.

I HAVE followed with lively interest the series of articles on the "Obligations of Wealth," which have appeared in the well-known NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and although I am more a man of deeds than of word or pen, I am quite ready to answer, so far as practicable, the question asked me as to "what motives have led me into my philanthropic work."

Do not expect me to enter into a theoretical discussion similar to those carried on by the able men who have developed in these pages a philosophical system regarding the duty of the possessor of riches; but allow me to set forth in a few words the practical method I have determined upon for carrying out my philanthropic ideas.

In regard to this there is, in my opinion, no possibility for doubt that the possession of great wealth lays a duty upon the possessor. It is my inmost conviction that I must consider myself as only the temporary administrator of the wealth I have amassed, and that it is my duty to contribute in my own way to the relief of the suffering of those who are hard pressed by fate. I contend most decidedly against the old system of alms-giving, which only makes so many more beggars; and I consider it the greatest problem in philanthropy to make human beings who are capable of work out of individuals who otherwise must become paupers, and in this way to create useful members of society.

Philanthropy in its proper sense has, no doubt, a higher purpose, and can find its best field for action in the creation of free

VOL. CLIII.—NO. 416.

1

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

libraries, green parks, beautiful churches, etc. This is Mr. Carnegie's idea, which he has practically demonstrated again and again. Certainly these are ideal objects, which tend to bring about universal happiness ; and lucky are they who live in lands where the absolute necessities of life are so well supplied that, I might almost say, one sees that the obligation of riches and the purposes of philanthropy are fulfilled in supplying the necessity of æsthetic pleasures. In relieving human suffering I never ask whether the cry of necessity comes from a being who belongs to my own faith or not ; but what is more natural than that I should find my highest purpose in bringing to the followers of Judaism, who have been oppressed for a thousand years, who are starving in misery, the possibility of a physical and moral regeneration ? —than that I should try to free them, to build them up into capable citizens, and thus furnish humanity with much new and valuable material ? Every page in the history of the Jews teaches us that in thinking this I am following no Utopian theory, and I am confident that such a result can be attained.

For it does not matter how low the disciples of the faith may have fallen, nor how crushed they may seem to be ; it only needs a single breath of freedom to bring honor and stimulus to the country to which they belong. The middle ages and modern times alike prove this. It is not necessary for me to cite examples, since the famous men who have raised themselves out of the Jewish race are well enough known, and since it cannot be the object of these lines to sing the praises of the Jews or the high spiritual qualities of their people. I will therefore keep myself to the question that has been put to me to answer—What results are to follow from my philanthropic labors ?

What I desire to accomplish, what, after many failures, has come to be the object of my life, and that for which I am ready to stake my wealth and my intellectual powers, is to give to a portion of my companions in faith the possibility of finding a new existence, primarily as farmers, and also as handicraftsmen, in those lands where the laws and religious tolerance permit them to carry on the struggle for existence as noble and responsible subjects of a humane government.

It has become a maxim and a typical reproach against the Jews that they have no inclination for agriculture or manual labor. That is an error which is contradicted not only by modern

examples, but by history. The Israelites in the time of Christ were agriculturists *par excellence*, while trade, which, judging from the practice of the Jews of to-day, should be the inheritance of Israel, lay then entirely in the hands of the Phoenicians, the Greeks, and the people of the Mediterranean states. The Jews, as long as they were politically independent, cared for their fields, as I have said. They drove their herds, and were handicraftsmen. The tendency towards work in the fields and in the shop existed, therefore, and my own observations and those of others have proved that it is quite possible to reawaken in the race this capacity and love for agriculture, and to bring it into existence again. Of his own power, therefore, the poor Jew, who until now has been hated as an outcast, will win for himself peace and independence, love for the ground he tills and for freedom; and he will become a patriotic citizen of his new home.

Guided by these convictions, my course for philanthropic work was clearly shown me. By establishing organizations in the Orient and in Galicia I wished to give the Jews who had remained in the faith the opportunity of becoming good farmers and craftsmen, without removing them from the land upon which they were settled, and agricultural schools and schools for manual training were to supply the means for teaching them.

It is necessary, however, to adopt some other method for aiding those Jews who are driven from their country, and are obliged to seek new homes across the ocean. And it is at present, therefore, my greatest desire to accomplish a work on a much more important scale, and of quite a different character from any adopted up to the present time—a purpose which, it may be reasonably hoped, will bring about the results already mentioned. The question is, then, to help the Russian Jews who have just been exiled from their homes to find new countries where they can use their powers freely, where they can bring into practice again the qualities they have inherited from their ancestors, and, finally, where they can become useful citizens of a free and secure country in which the rights of all inhabitants are equal.

In considering this plan, I naturally thought of the United States, where the liberal constitution is a guarantee of happy development for the followers of all religious faiths. Yet I was obliged to confess that to increase to any great extent the already enormous number of Jews in the United States would

be of advantage neither to the country itself nor to the exiled Jews ; for it is my firm conviction that this new settlement should be scattered through different lands and spread over a large space, so that there shall be no opportunity for social or religious rupture. I made a study, therefore, of different countries, and after careful examination I have become convinced that the Argentine Republic, Canada, and Australia, above all others, offer the surest guarantee for the accomplishment of the plan. I expect to begin with the Argentine Republic, and arrangements for the purchase of certain lands for the settlement are now being made.

I do not undertake the execution of so weighty a work without much preparatory study as to whether the Jewish race has or has not an inclination towards agriculture. The following example will go far to silence any doubt in this direction and to prove the capacity of the Jews for farming and colonization.

Some years ago several hundred Jewish families were exiled from Russia to the Argentine. In spite of untold suffering, in spite of the greatest hindrances which they encountered, they succeeded in taking root in their new homes. These same families, which a few years ago, bending under heavy burdens, appeared to be only wandering trades-people in Russia, have now become thrifty farmers, who with plough and hoe know how to farm as well as if they had never done anything else. They lay out their farms in the best manner, and build themselves such pretty little houses that every one in the vicinity employs them as carpenters in housebuilding.

The knowledge of this guides me in my work, and I am now setting out with all my strength to accomplish it.

This is, in a few words, the idea which leads me in my philanthropic work—the motive that lies at the bottom of the plan. The working of a huge cosmopolitan scheme would scatter my strength broadcast. If I devote myself, however, to this one work, I can perhaps bring it to eventual accomplishment. And all through the matter I have the certainty that he who frees thousands of his fellow-men from suffering and an oppressed existence, and helps them to become useful citizens, does a good work for all humanity.

M. DE HIRSCH.

THE FARMERS' DISCONTENT.

BY L. L. POLK, PRESIDENT OF THE FARMERS' ALLIANCE.

BUT for the closing paragraph of the contribution of Mr. George E. Waring, Jr., to the June number of *THE REVIEW*, it might have been read and dismissed with some commendation, even by one who feels a peculiar interest in everything that touches upon the condition of the American farmer. But the remark, "That the present Alliance movement will directly improve the situation is not likely," inspires a re-reading of the article, and also an inclination to clarify some things which were passed over in the first reading as being rather erratic, but not harmful.

The discontent of the farmers threatens "a grave disturbance in the equilibrium of national affairs" may be properly regarded as the basic proposition of the article in question. This proposition alone is a most tempting one for treatment; and the treatment might be begun by asking, What is the present "equilibrium of national affairs"? It is not proposed, however, to enter upon such a discussion here, and the matter may be passed over with the statement that the farming element has ever been the first and most potential in establishing an equilibrium in a republican form of government, and in efforts to maintain it. The simple truth is, there is now no equilibrium, and the farmers are moving to restore that which may have been, or to establish an equilibrium on a broader scale than has formerly been necessary.

Mr. Waring seemingly makes an effort to detract from the importance of farming as a feature of existing social organization. It is, he says, "the basis of the social organization only in the sense of having been its beginning." The admission that it is the beginning is an admission that it is the foundation. There can be no safe and complete superstructure without a foundation, though the foundation may exist without the superstructure.

The acknowledgment that society cannot be maintained without the food-producer is made perforce; but the assertion that it cannot be maintained "without millers and butchers and grocers and cooks and the whole round of purveyors and workers" is open to questioning. It might be legitimately asked what kind of social organization demands all these workers, and what kind could be maintained without them. The present social organization demands—and the demand is supplied—speculators, race-courses, gamblers, trusts, monopolies, "combines," breweries, bar-rooms, railroad pools, subsidies, and the like. Surely Mr. Waring will not assert that a society meeting all the demands of the highest conception of civilization cannot be maintained without these.

The evidence of the past tells of quite an endurable form of society when there were no professional carpenters, cooks, millers, butchers, etc. People lived, and as a consequence we live. One of epicurean tastes, in making a comparison of the ancient and modern forms of society, might say that keeping one's self alive is not living; but there is no living without keeping alive. The engine may be beautiful, but it is useless without the steam. The banquet-hall is uninviting without the products of the farm. An attempt to rank any vocation with the importance and necessity of farming will ever prove futile.

The Hon. J. M. Rusk, Secretary of Agriculture, is authority for the statement that one-half of our population depends on agriculture. Mr. Waring says: "The fact that those in one industry outnumber those in another does not give them a greater claim to consideration." This is noticed because it conveys an implication that the farmers are demanding greater consideration than that accorded to other classes, or that somebody is demanding it for them. It would be impossible to sustain either implication. The great fundamental principle of the discontented farmers is "equal rights to all, special privileges to none." They have made demands for legislation which they believe would be beneficial to them, though not exclusively. Some of these demands have been strenuously opposed on the ground that they can be acceded to only through "class" legislation. The objection is debatable, but let it be admitted for the sake of argument. The farmer points to statute-books full of legislation in the interest of other classes, and exclaims: "Equal rights for all."

If it be right to legislate for the manufacturer and shipbuilder and banker, why not for me ?”

“ But,” says the legislator, “ one of your tenets is ‘ special privileges to none.’ How can you ask for special legislation ?” The farmer replies : “ Yes ; ‘ special privileges to none.’ Then take away the special privileges you have accorded to the manufacturer, the shipbuilder, and the banker.”

The farmer has never made claim for greater consideration than is accorded to other classes, and only until very recently, when overwhelmed and discouraged by adverse conditions and discriminating legislation, has he asked for the same consideration from national power that nearly all other classes have enjoyed for years. The test of “ industry, skill, frugality, and fair dealing ” has been applied to the vocation of farming under existing economic conditions without encouraging results. The average land-owner and farmer, though exercising the most consummate skill and practising the most rigid economy, cannot hope to achieve fortune in a lifetime. The speculator in “ futures ” and the manipulator of stocks, with no knowledge of frugality and without legitimate skill, achieve fortunes in a day.

In defining what is “ truly the basis of our national prosperity,” Mr. Waring indulges in misleading, if not erroneous, language. “ National prosperity ” is a term which may not be properly applied to the condition of a country or society a large part of whose population is struggling under adverse and oppressive circumstances which arise from national legislation. It is a term which cannot be applied without violence to the condition of this country, whose national records show the existence of nine millions of mortgages on the farms and homesteads of sixty-three millions of people—a mortgage to every seven individuals, or a mortgage for every four families out of five. If intended to apply to such a condition as this, it is misleading. The possible error lies in the assertion that “ industry, skill, frugality, and fair dealing ” are the basis of national prosperity.

Mr. Waring adds : “ The sphere in which these are applied is immaterial.” This leaves a loop-hole of escape from every objection that may be urged to the assertion. It was evidently intended to apply to individuals in the pursuit of their various callings, and if this, and this only, were meant, the force of the assertion could be easily broken ; for there would be no difficulty

in establishing the fact that "industry, skill," etc., cannot be effective in such vocations in civilized society as may be subject to the adverse effects of discriminating legislation. But if this were shown, Mr. Waring might escape through his loop-hole by saying he meant that legislation, as well as any other component part of the social organism, must be characterized by "industry, skill, frugality, and fair dealing."

What he asserts to be the basis of our national prosperity is, in a society and civilization so large and advanced as ours, merely the basis of existence. The responsibility is not assumed here of affirming just where the line between existence and prosperity should be drawn. Let it be admitted, however, that he who has anything over and above what is necessary for actual existence is prosperous. Does the owner of this surplus, be it little or much, hold it and enjoy it by personal "industry, skill, frugality, and fair dealing," or are his tenure and enjoyment of the surplus secured and protected by such legislation or compact as the individuals composing the society are willing to submit to? If this latter question could be negatived, it would carry the affirmation that legislation is unnecessary, unless it can be established that legislation may be so framed and administered as to aid equally all the individuals of a large society in acquiring whatever is necessary to make them prosperous. To deal fully and effectively with this proposition would require a more elaborate argument than can be contained within the limits to which this article must be confined; for the presentation of such an argument would necessitate the production of a second argument to show that the realm of nationalism was not being invaded.

The proposition, however, is not new; it was a tenet of the framer of our national constitution, and was expressed by him in the words, "You can legislate prosperity or adversity on yourselves." The truth and force of this enunciation are beginning to be felt by the whole people, and they are awaking to the realization that, in a society which has reached the stage and dimensions of ours, legislation is the basis of national prosperity. In this their conviction is so strong that they are proposing legislative remedies for existing evils and inequalities; but the step was not taken until they had sought long and earnestly, but in vain, to evolve some other method of dealing effectively with the condition as it is found.

"If farmers constitute a 'class,' it is a class that is not chained to the tilling of the ground," is the opening sentence of one of Mr. Waring's divisions. The same may be said of any "class." The banker is not chained to banking, nor the manufacturer to manufacturing. But the banker never voluntarily relinquishes his vocation to indulge in farming for the purpose of achieving a livelihood, while recent statistics show that erstwhile thrifty farmers have been compelled to abandon farms and seek employment by which they could realize a living remuneration for their exertions. There are innumerable instances to show that a skill and an ability which could not wring mediocre existence from the farm have achieved phenomenal success in other pursuits. There is small risk in asserting that in no case has the abandonment of a farm been attended with more adverse conditions than those experienced on it.

One of the anxieties of the average intelligent farmer is that some provision may be made by which his son may follow some other pursuit, and the son, who may have spent a few years on the farm, entertains the liveliest sympathy with that anxiety. No further evidence is needed to show that, under the present economic conditions, almost any pursuit is considered preferable to that of farming. There may be a transient dismissal of the whole matter by saying to the farmer: "If you do not like it, other vocations are open to you." This is measurably true, but the advice is superfluous. There has been and now is a fleeing from the farms that causes an astonishing increase of population and overcrowding in the cities, and the sufferers from the overcrowding are not those who flock from the rural districts. Their rugged ability and sterling worth soon crush out such competition as is met in the life-long city element, which becomes the suffering element wherever suffering follows influx of population; and this crushed-out element is neither fitted nor able to repair to and conduct the abandoned farms. A condition which would follow a total abandonment of farms can be more easily imagined than described.

The farmer's discontent arises not so much from the limited latitude of success offered by the farm as from the impositions of legislation effected while he was devoting his whole attention to his immediate business, and intrusting his interests, as a citizen of the nation, to representatives who have betrayed that trust. The farming element is the only one in our entire social

organization that can make this complaint justly; for while some other elements may not have had special national legislation in their behalf, there have been no adverse discriminations. Nothing can be added to Mr. Waring's assertion that "farmers themselves, if a fair chance is allowed them, can and will look out for their own condition more effectively than others can." The "fair chance" is all they have asked for, but in this case asking has not been followed by receiving, and they have felt constrained to present their requests in the form of demands, and ask the nation why those demands should not be acceded to.

"Our duty of the hour, so far as the farmer is concerned, is to see that he has a fair field," is the beginning of Mr. Waring's fourth and last division. The two words "our duty" suggest some questions. From what position or elevation does he write? What coterie or element is meant to be included in that "our"? and is it a coterie or element which the farmer may trust to secure for him a fair field without himself as a supervisor or questioner? If there be an assumption that there is a duty toward the farmer from a class which appropriates a dignity and importance superior to his, he will want to know if such a class proposes to lift him to its own *high standard*. If it be assumed that this class is more able to legislate for and care for the interests of the farmer than he is to legislate for himself, he may grant the assumption, but he will not trust the class. The reckless practical disregard of pretty sentiment, and the almost general repudiation of pledges and promises expressed and made in favor of the farmer for many years, have instilled into him a notion that he must secure and maintain his "fair field" by personal exertion, if he is to have it at all; and anything now presented spreading forth a new phase of duty or conveying a new variety of pledge or promise comes too late to influence him to step aside and longer trust his interests to others. He is passing the stage where he can be deluded by flattery. He has decided that he must interest himself in his own behalf, and he will continue to demand what he conceives to be "equal rights to all, special privileges to none," until they shall be acquired, or until he shall be convinced that such a condition is impossible in what boasts itself to be a civilized society.

Mr. Waring's article concludes with a doubt whether the present Alliance movement will improve the situation. The ultimate re-

sult of any movement is more or less problematical ; but the achievement of any result lies in a movement toward that end. Civilized history furnishes nothing to parallel the general and rapid spread of the Alliance ; yet no movement was ever more fiercely and bitterly and unreasonably assailed, even by those who profess to be in sympathy with the very principles on which it is founded and which it seeks to establish. The organization is composed of a class of people who stay at their homes and by their firesides unless stern necessity calls them away. They did not create the necessity which called forth the organization.

The Alliance has no special desire to "directly improve the situation." That is to say, it is immaterial to the order as to whether an improvement shall come directly through it or its members, or in some other way ; but its plain attitude toward the existing powers through which improvement can come is want of confidence ; and, while maintaining this attitude, small pressure is needed to drive it to take such action as it can to effect a change in the general situation. It has already accomplished much, in that the largest class of our society has been led by it to study political economies and to examine into methods and machinery of government ; and its influence as a political factor will be plainly evidenced in such national legislation as may be enacted while it exists as an organization. There will be less extravagance, less jobbery, and less practical corruption. If only this shall be accomplished, enough will have been done to remove any foundation on which rests doubt as to the power of the Alliance in influencing a change for the better ; for with a purer administration of public affairs must come a decrease of such legislation as tends to operate for the emolument of one class or industry at the expense of another ; and this is the evil against which the efforts of the Alliance are chiefly directed.

The reason given by Mr. Waring for the doubt he entertains shows that his knowledge of the sterling qualities of the American farmer is very limited, or that he, in common with many others, arrogates the right and privilege to feel a contempt for the farmer. If this be not so, why should his article close with such a gross insult to the sturdy and faithful tiller of the soil as is conveyed in the following words : "There are already indications that professional politicians will buy farms, will pay the expense of Alliance meetings, and will capture the Alliance vote"?

What can this be but an implication that the organized farmers of America are a herd of human beings over whom tangible corruption will have more influence than justice and right? and what is it but the strong reflection of a hope entertained by certain classes that it may be so? The farmers admit without reservation that they have been grievously deceived and imposed upon, but they have never sanctioned the enactment of a single national measure under which they now suffer through the influence of corruption. Being honest in heart themselves, they trusted others, only to be environed by such conditions as have brought upon them a discouragement which paralyzes their energies and weakens their patriotism as applied to the upholding of affairs of government, and which threatens the destruction of their domesticity. Having learned, and knowing, that these conditions are artificial, they have arisen to demand that the power which made them shall remove them; and they cannot be made to waver in their demands by a declaration that corruption will be made their antagonizing force. As a class they will maintain their sincerity and honesty, and the only corruption that shall prevail against them will be such as can be found in a preponderating number of corrupt men.

L. L. POLK.

THE FARMER ON TOP.

BY ERASTUS WIMAN.

It is a safe assertion that no subject is quite so important to the world as the world's supply of food. Progress in civilization, in science, in art, even in religion, is all bound up in the problem of getting enough to eat. The life that is forms the essential element in the life that is to come, whether on this earth or elsewhere; and the ability to get enough to eat, of the best kind, and commensurate with a moderate effort, is a matter of greater interest, of more far-reaching importance, than any other that can occupy the mind.

In a period of such abundant plenty as in the last quarter of a century seems to have oppressed the world, it would look akin to folly to begin to talk about an impending scarcity of food-products. When the chief evil of the generation of producers now passing away has been that of overproduction, resulting in destruction of profit, it would indeed be a revolution of vast import if the coming generation of producers were able to grow only just enough to meet the demand, and be enormously enriched thereby. When by improved means of communication, owing to parallel strips of iron laid through the country, vast stretches of territory have been made readily available, together with the result of man's inventive faculty as applied to agricultural implements, the power to produce food has been enormously stimulated, to begin to talk about a possible limit to production seems a startling change in conditions. Especially is it a startling change when, in view of these widened areas, and this marked success in the employment of machinery to perform the work of human hands, resulting in a consequent perfection in agricultural pursuits, there should be slowly, but most certainly, creeping up a power to absorb and consume of even greater proportions. Yet it is a fact, as startling as it is true to those who watch closely the trend of

supply and demand in the article of food, that the power of absorption or consumption of food-products has at length caught up to the power of production ; and that the possible ratio of increase in consumption is much greater than the immediate possible ratio of increase in the growth of food.

Perhaps more clearly than by anything else this is shown in three totals of the figures of the census now being completed ; these being that, while the whole country has increased in population over 26 per cent., the cities have grown at a rate of increase of over 45 per cent., while the farming population has increased only 14 per cent. The growth of consumption of food-products, as shown by the growth of cities, is proportionately greater than has ever been shown in an equal period heretofore in the world's history. Though the increase in the number of farmers in ten years to the extent of 14 per cent. is greater than is shown elsewhere in the world during the decade, yet the disparity between 14 and 45 per cent. is so great that a moment's reflection will show its deep significance in relation to the production and consumption of food. The aggregations of humanity in the cities and towns are in no broad sense food-producers, but in the largest sense food-consumers and food-wasters.

But in the face of the great increase in the demand for produce, implied by the growth of cities and towns, there stalks into sight an apparition, in the shape of another condition, so unexpected and so startling as hardly to be credited. This is nothing more or less than a realization of two important facts : (1) the extent of the exhaustion of arable soils ; (2) the hardly realizable circumstance that no more new wheat lands remain unoccupied in the United States. In other words, if a farmer's son or a new-comer seeks to secure land that will probably produce bread, to do so he must displace an occupant already in possession, or go without. That a "land-hunger" should at this early date in the history of the country exist, and be unappeased, would seem impossible on a continent whose land areas were supposed to be illimitable, and whose soil was supposed to be inexhaustible. That no lands are available is a conclusion so unexpected and so extraordinary that it is no wonder people doubt the truth of such a statement. Yet that a land-hunger of the keenest character does exist is proved in numerous sections, and perhaps more vividly than by anything else by the scenes which occurred at the

opening of the territory of Oklahoma two years ago, and which have since been repeated with terrible earnestness on every occasion upon which government land-offices were open for allotment of homesteads. When, as in Ashland, Wisconsin, last winter, men and women stand in line, ankle deep in snow, all day and all night, from Thursday until Saturday, waiting for their turn to register; and when the Secretary of the Interior at a later date was compelled to close the land-office because it was in possession of a mob, who only became such because of their eager desire for the registration of their names, there is proof of a craze for land which nothing else in the previous history of this country has paralleled.

Perhaps the most striking sign of the exhaustion of soils, on the one hand, and the rapid occupancy of lands, on the other, is found in connection with the production of wheat, and its steady northern trend until now half the continent is fed by supplies from the northernmost States. The reader will confirm this by his or her own experience, in realizing the simple circumstance that the bread habitually served for meals in the household comes from Minnesota or Dakota, or from a region quite as far away. Why an article so essential to human life as wheaten flour, which should be furnished at a cost so free from unnecessary charges, and which is in universal use in quantities so vast, should be subjected to a charge for freightage averaging from 1,000 to 2,000 miles, is a problem that can only be answered by the statement that it cannot be produced with profit nearer. It was not always so. Many readers of these pages, especially those resident in the Eastern and Middle States, are old enough to recall the fact that nearly all the wheat consumed in their youthful days was grown in the Genesee valley of New York. Rochester was named the "Flour City" because of its great mills in the midst of a great wheat-yielding region. It is still called by a name that sounds similar, viz., the "Flower City," but this is because of the great nurseries and seed-gardens that so adorn it. It has been robbed of its glory as a food-centre by Minneapolis, 2,000 miles to the north, now the great flour-producing city, from which radiate supplies that keep alive fully one-half the population of this once great agricultural country.

When the regions that supply the mills of Minneapolis are exhausted, as the regions, so far as wheat is concerned, between the

Genesee valley and the valley of the Red River of the North have been exhausted, what new Northern State will step in to supply the need that will be so imperative as that of food? Abandoned farms in the half-dozen States of New England, the exhausted soils in the Middle States, the urgent need for expensive fertilization in numerous Western areas, are supplemented in suggestiveness by the discovery of the limitations of the rain-belt in western Kansas and Nebraska, and the universality of the movement near the Rocky Mountains for expensive irrigation in wide areas of soil too poor by nature to be cultivated except by artificial aids.

It is true that this wide survey of the conditions apparent on the surface of the country includes many a verdant valley, and many a hillside where wheat and other bread grains can and will be grown with profit; and that perhaps the inferences drawn of exhaustion and sterility for wheat may be extreme. But the fact remains that with the growth in the consumption of bread the immediate power to produce it in numerous wide localities does not keep pace; and that even in wheat-growing areas the increase is in meagre proportion to the increase in the number of mouths to be filled. The limitations in area are within sight; the power of production to the average acreage is known; but the growth of human life—the increase in the number to consume—is without limit. If it goes on by the same leaps and bounds in the next fifty years as in the last half-century, there are children now living who will see the population of this country from one hundred and fifty to two hundred millions of people, which vast aggregation will derive its bread from an area that even now has reached the northern boundary and is beginning to realize for its food out-put prices far in excess of what a brief period ago were deemed possible.

But it is unnecessary to wait fifty years, or anything like it, to realize the consequences of an exhaustion of the raw material from which profitable farms are made. The rapidity with which farms were taken up and the spare land occupied between 1870 and 1880 has been the cause of the depression which so universally prevailed among the farmer class. Excessive competition was its curse, and overproduction the cause of the low prices and the destruction of its profit. This is shown by the fact that for the fourteen years ending with 1885 the cultivated area of the United

States increased 112 per cent., while the population increased but 44 per cent. But the very rapidity of occupancy is now producing its reactionary effect, not because there is a lessened demand for land or a restricted number of cultivators, nor even because of low prices, but because there is so little unoccupied land available which it is profitable to cultivate. While the population continues to increase at the rate of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in every five years, the area now being taken up has not in that period increased 7 per cent., and it is yearly and progressively lessening. In this connection the fact is a most significant one that the quantity of land in cultivation, the production of which is necessarily marketed abroad, has declined from twenty-one millions of acres in 1885 thirteen millions in 1890.

Confirmatory of this statement of the general conditions of production and occupancy of land is a striking compilation by Mr. C. Wood Davis, of Goddard, Kansas, who, as a farmer himself, obtained a perfect knowledge of the practical difficulties that surround his class, and who, as a painstaking student of statistics, has furnished to his fellow-farmers, and to the people at large, conclusions that have placed the whole country under an obligation to him. From numerous calculations of great value, forming the basis of much of the discussion now going forward on this most important topic of the food supply and the farmer's position, the following is selected as illustrative of the progressively decreasing rate at which additions are made to the cultivable area, which, being certain to continue while the population increases at a greater ratio, will result in placing the farmer on top :

Year.	Cultivated area in staple crops.	Increase of culti- vated area in each period and rate per cent. of increase.		Increase of culti- vated area each year during each period and yearly per cent. of increase.	
	Acres.	Acres.	Rate per cent.	Acres.	Rate per cent.
1871.....	93,000,000				
1875.....	123,000,000	30,000,000	*32.2	7,500,000	8.1
1880.....	165,000,000	*42,000,000	34.1	8,240,000	6.8
1885.....	197,000,000	32,000,000	19.4	6,400,000	3.9
1890.....	211,000,000	*14,000,000	*7.1	2,800,000	1.4

* Note rapid diminution in aggregates of such increase and in the rate per cent.

The inference to be drawn from this steady decline in increase of percentage of area of cultivation is that prices must advance if

there is a corresponding increase in consumption, as there is certain to be. It is true that a foreign demand regulates prices, and that the out-put of foreign nations may make up for the decrease in the surplus from America. But this argument is met with the inquiry, If the bread-producing areas in the new world are lessening in proportion to consumption, what may not be inferred from conditions that prevail in crowded Europe, where land is scarce and population increasingly large? The apparent facts do not justify the conclusion that hereafter foreign sources of supply will largely influence either out-put or prices. Indeed, the action of almost all the European countries indicates a great anxiety in regard to this question of food-products, in the face of increase of population and extreme narrowness of cultivable area, as shown in the removal of restrictions and reductions of duty, which almost every week recently have been reported.

The figures regarding the increased wheat area the world over are ascertained, and not only show how large a percentage is contained within the United States, but how marked is the decrease in proportion to population. Thus, in the decade from 1870 to 1880 the wheat areas of the world increased twenty-two millions of acres, of which the United States contributed nineteen millions. In the decade from 1880 to 1890 the wheat areas of the world increased only five millions of acres, to which the United States contributed not an acre. Meanwhile the population of the bread-eating world increased 11 per cent., and goes on increasing irrespective of the fact that the land which can grow grain at previous prices is well-nigh exhausted, so far as relative increase is concerned. Take, for instance, the population of India. It is said to be increasing three times as fast as its cultivable area, and although its exports rose in seventeen years from 500,000 bushels to 41,000,000 bushels in 1887, the increase, it is believed, has reached its limit. Because of the increase of population and the restricted area of cultivation, the inhabitants cannot afford to cultivate wheat, much less live upon it, as is shown by the fact that the area under wheat cultivation at the end of 1889 was a million acres less than ten years ago. The whole situation seems summed up in *The American Agriculturist* for May in these brief words:

"It is quite safe to say that the yearly additions to the bread-eating populations of European blood are such as to require an addition yearly to

the wheat and rye supply of the world of from 30,000,000 to 32,000,000 bushels, or the product of 2,500,000 to 2,700,000 acres. Yet the entire wheat- and rye-growing world has, of recent years, been adding not to exceed 400,000 acres per annum, or less than one-sixth of the increased requirements. Moreover, there is no country where the present rate of increase is likely to be much accelerated at an early day."

Bearing with great force upon this question of food-supply is the fact that this is the census year in most of the world. The results of an enumeration so world-wide enable accurate estimates to be formed of the growth in consumption of food; and as the areas and productiveness of food-lands are ascertained with more or less definiteness the inferences to be drawn all point in the direction of an increasing tax upon the producing power of the world. For instance, the United Kingdom is cultivated to an extent beyond which it would be difficult to improve; yet its population, by the census just completed (on the night of April 5), shows 39,700,000, or an increase of 3,000,000 in five years. Austria-Hungary completed the census last month, showing an increase of 2,250,000. Germany in five years has grown 2,265,000, now reaching 49,120,000, as against 41,058,000 ten years ago. France, the country with the smallest percentage of growth, has a million more mouths to feed than in 1885, while Russia is known to have increased 10,000,000 in the first five years of the decade, and certainly as much in the last five years, thus adding 20,000,000 to the newcomers into the world. Italy, notwithstanding heavy emigration, will, it is estimated, add 1,000,000 to its population, while India is believed to have grown in ten years from 255,000,000 to 285,000,000. Grouping the increase in all these eight countries together, it shows in the old world the addition of over 76,000,000 of lives to be sustained by food got from the ground, without anything like corresponding increase in either cultivable area or in its productiveness.

In startling connection with the foregoing figures of new population, it is appropriate to draw again upon the calculations of Mr. C. Wood Davis, who from the eery of his farm in Kansas, after careful observation, startles the world with the following conclusions:

"From the best data obtainable it would appear that with an average yield the world's crop of wheat and rye is now 70,000,000 bushels less than the yearly consumption. Each passing year, by reason of the increase in population, adds at least 25,000,000 bushels to this yearly deficit, so that by 1895 it can hardly be less than 200,000,000, if the *per-capita* requirements re-

main as large as they have been. Up to this time the reserves accumulated during the existence of the surplus acreage added in the eighth decade have sufficed to meet this deficit, but there are indications in every grain-growing country that these reserves are everywhere nearly or quite exhausted. The injury already sustained by the growing European crop renders it absolutely certain that the coming cereal year will dispose of the last vestige of these reserves."

Sufficient has been adduced to make it plain that the possibility of prices remaining at a low ebb is past. It is clear, therefore, that the farmer hereafter will realize a fair profit upon his operations. It is time that he should do so. Of all classes his rewards have been the smallest, while they should have been the most satisfactory.

The extent of the farmer's loss by low prices and the extent of his gain by high prices may be judged by the advance in the amount to be realized in these different conditions. Thus in 1875 the average price in gold of English-grown wheat in the markets of Great Britain was \$1.64 per bushel. During the five years ending with 1889 it was 95 cents per bushel. In other words, there was a difference of 69 cents, equal to a decline of 42 per cent. in the income of every wheat-producer, and, as a matter of fact, of every producer of food, arising out of compulsory exports from India and the creation of too many American farms. With a restoration of the former high price, the gain to the producer will equal the amount of which he has hitherto been deprived. Now, an increase of 42 per cent. in the income of any individual, or any class of individuals, is a most momentous matter. But when it affects a class so large as that which follows agricultural pursuits, and when, in addition to that special class, it equally and directly affects the vast number in town and village who are related to and dependent upon the farmer, the consequences of an increase of revenue to such a great percentage can hardly be over-estimated.

It is true that the difference in the price of wheat in Great Britain in 1875, when it was \$1.64, and for the five years ending with 1889, when it averaged only 90 cents, may not be immediately made up, but all the signs are in favor of dollar wheat at the farm, and, if anything, above that sum. It is also true that wheat does not comprise by any means the total out-put of the farmer, but the price of wheat is the key to the agricultural situ-

ation, for out of 13,500,000 acres now used for the production of food for exportation, between 8,000,000 and 9,000,000 are devoted to wheat-growing. It is the one great staple that all the nations of western and southern Europe export largely, and is the one grain for which a market, at some price, can always be found, while it bears transportation and storage with less deterioration than any other food-product. As wheat rises or falls, all other food-products increase or decline, and if a gain of 40 per cent. in the rise of wheat is promised to the farmer, it may be relied upon that this relative gain is likely to pervade all his crops.

An increase equal to 40 per cent. in the paying power of the farmer of North America will make at this time a greater economic revolution than has ever yet been witnessed. The first thing that will happen will be that the farmer will get out of debt. The sorrowful years of burden which in the last decade he has suffered from heavy obligations of mortgage, interest, and store-indebtedness will cause him to hasten the day when he can be a free man. As a borrower, he will no longer fill the position of servant to the lender. Having once hypothecated their future in the expectation of continued prosperity and high prices in the past, as a class the farmers have had an experience that most men would have sunk under. The pursuit of happiness, which is a guarantee under the constitution, and which in this fair land more than in all others would seem easy of accomplishment, has been like chasing an *ignis fatuus* in a huge fog-bank of indebtedness. The weary waiting for better times, the nights of sleepless anxiety, and the days of unrequited labor, the narrowness of resources, and the eager desire of the young people for better modes of living, have all been borne in expectation of the day that now dawns upon every industrious farmer in the land. It was no wonder that unrest prevailed, and that a striking-out for relief in legislation, or some other form of remedy by organization, was tried. But the futility of those movements is even now becoming apparent to them, and will sink out of sight in the certainty of improvement in conditions which is sure to follow the gain in purchasing and paying power of 40, or even 25, per cent. It seems impossible to doubt from all that has been here adduced that such a change is coming.

This change will put the American farmer on top. It will make him, of all classes in the world, the most prosperous. He

will be the most independent and the most intelligent and prosperous producer of his period, and by organization and a reasonable control of politics, which he is likely to maintain, he will probably dictate the fiscal policy of the nation. Having attained prosperity by the operation of natural laws, he will abandon the absurd theories under which, in the days of his depression, some of his representatives sought relief by laws made by legislation ; and it will not be surprising if he reaches the conclusion that the least interference with trade, the least taxation, and the least legislation will be the popular movement, setting in as a reactionary sentiment from that which has hitherto prevailed.

With an ability to buy twice or thrice the quantity of goods hitherto absorbed, with a desire to possess himself of every comfort, and to deny his children nothing that they need and can enjoy, the absorption of manufactured goods will be enormously increased. The excess in production of articles of necessity and luxury, now apparent on every hand, will be absorbed. This process, aided by an increased foreign trade, which is promised under reciprocity, would seem to open up a prospect for still another great group of population, namely, those engaged in manufacturing pursuits. These have already begun to feel the pressure of overproduction, as evidenced in numerous labor troubles all over the country. But with the improved condition of the farmer, a larger demand will exist for all classes of goods. Every farmer's wife will be able to afford a silk dress ; every farmer's daughter will have an elaborate trousseau. From ploughs to pianos, from buggies to books, the range will include all articles for farm life, for which a new demand will be stimulated by a new ability to buy and to pay. There will, doubtless, therefore, be felt throughout the country a new thrill of industrial activity, as the necessary reflection of the enhanced prosperity of the greatest and the most worthy group of growers that the world has ever seen.

ERASTUS WIMAN.

DOMESTIC SERVICE IN ENGLAND.

BY MISS EMILY FAITHFULL.

THE relations existing between servants and their employers have been much discussed of late : we have been told that an antagonism is growing up which is "shaking the pillars of domestic peace"; one writer inveighs against "the semi-feudal relations" and holds a spirited brief for the maid ; another declares that "good old-fashioned mistresses" have died out, while in certain quarters the problem is considered "as momentous as that of capital and labor, and as complicated as that of individualism and socialism."

In one of George Eliot's novels, the landlord whose customers appeal to him to settle an argument which has arisen in the bar parlor about a village ghost-tale, states his intention of "holding with both sides, as the truth lies between them." I confess that his attitude very much represents my own feeling when I hear of the faults and follies of servants and the grinding tyranny of the nineteenth-century mistress. There is an old proverb to the effect that "one story is very well till the other is told"; and perhaps the whole grievance might be well summed up in the assertion that imperfect masters and mistresses cannot get perfect servants, and that servants are no more a failure than any other class laboring under disadvantages to which I shall more particularly allude before the end of my observations on this vexed question.

It may be true that domestic relations have not adjusted themselves at present to the modern spirit of human life, but there is no clear evidence that the servants of to-day are really inferior to those who waited on our ancestors in olden times ; and in spite of the oft-repeated tale that there are "no servants to be had," I have never yet met any one who ever sought one in vain. Although the class of people who never dreamt of having servants a hundred years ago require them now, still the supply is

equal to the demand; and this, too, in spite of the system of emigration which takes hundreds of young English and Irish women to the colonies and America.

It is not within the purpose of this article to touch upon the difficulties which surround domestic service in the United States; but I may, perhaps, be allowed to remark that I was much struck, while travelling there, with the independent bearing of "the help," especially in the far West, and also with the vast amount of work done in large houses by one or two women—mostly Irish—with only the assistance of the man who comes once a day to do "the chores." Similar establishments to these in England would demand from four to six servants; but it must be admitted that social habits are more simple in America and labor-saving machines are far more abundant: lifts connect the kitchen with the dining-room in even ordinary houses, and the hot- and cold-water pipes which are connected with the washstands in the bedrooms considerably diminish the housemaids' duties, especially as there is an outlet for the water used as well.

In America "the hired girl" is apt to leave at a moment's notice if anything displeases her, but an English servant seldom packs up her boxes and places her mistress in this inconvenient position: she gives a month's notice if she finds her place does not suit her, and as she looks to her mistress for a character, she is generally anxious to make a good impression before leaving. On the other hand, a lady has no right to discharge a servant without due warning; she is only justified in dismissing a servant "at a moment's notice" on the grounds of wilful disobedience to lawful orders, drunkenness, theft, habitual negligence or moral misconduct, abusive language, and incompetence or permanent incapacity from illness. In Scotland a six-months' engagement generally prevails—a system which is far less satisfactory to both the contracting parties if a mistake has been made by either of them.

No lady is legally bound to give a domestic servant a character, but it is an unwritten law that a mistress should fairly state all she knows in favor of the girl who is leaving her service: such communications are regarded as "privileged," but any evidence of malice would render the person guilty of it liable to an action at the suit of the servant, and "a false character" "knowingly given" can be punished by a penalty of £20 if the servant in whose

interest it has been made robs the mistress who in consequence of such a misrepresentation takes her into her employment.

The "I'm-as-good-as-you" sort of spirit is by no means the characteristic of the well-trained English servant: her own self-respect teaches her to accord the deference due to those she serves, and she takes a pride in the dainty cap and spotless white apron which are regarded in America as "badges of slavery," for they distinguish her from the type of servants employed in inferior houses where such adornments are unknown and are regarded by mistresses as useless "luxuries."

There is a wide gulf between the ordinary "slavey" and the well-disciplined servant, both as regards personality and treatment. The general servant may perhaps have a "good time" of it in the tradesman's household where she is literally treated as one of the family, and fancies her equality established by the fact that she addresses all the children by their Christian names, takes her place with the family at meals, and spends her Sunday "in" at ease in the one sitting-room in the establishment, in familiar intercourse with her employers. But the lodging-house "slavey" has no rest for the sole of her foot from one week's end to the other. Her mistress, a woman of the same class probably, often treats her with a want of consideration that no lady could possibly show: it is true that the woman works very hard herself, cooking the meals of the lodgers, who breakfast and dine at different hours, but she is, of course, fortified by the gains she is making; the poor drudge, however, is toiling from morning to night for a mere pittance of perhaps £10 to £12 a year, learning nothing that will ever fit her for a better situation, and with hard words, instead of thanks, for all her efforts to please every one.

I shall never forget the impression made on my own mind by an incident which occurred to me when I had rooms in a lodging-house in one of the most fashionable parts of London, while the house I had bought was being decorated for me. I went to my bedroom after being at the first performance of a play at the Lyceum, at which Mr. Irving had been required to make a speech, and, coming home very late and tired, hastily retired to rest by the dim light of a melancholy candle. While undressing I was startled by a sound which warned me that some one was in my room: on looking round I saw what at first seemed to me a bun-

dle of clothes hanging over a chair ; it turned out to be the poor "slavey," who, worn out with the day's fatigues, while putting the finishing touches to my bedroom had sat down and fallen sound asleep in the armchair. She must have been there for at least two hours ! Up at six o'clock in the morning, seldom able to go to bed in her miserable attic till after midnight, and only half-fed, this unfortunate girl may be regarded as a type of a class of servants in England who are really much to be pitied.

A girl whose "first place" is in a lodging-house, or who, as the hard-worked, underfed scrub in a small tradesman's large family, in which the care of the perpetual baby falls to her lot, as well as housework of all kinds, has no sinecure ; she seldom finds any one who tries to give her an idea of the intelligent, methodical way in which she should set about her duties, and is consequently disgusted with the vocation, anxious to abandon it for the freedom of the factory, and ready to advise all her companions to do the same. The miserable little drudge has been treated by the petty tyrants into whose hands she unfortunately fell as one who was to be used as their abject slave, without the least regard to her feelings or inclinations ; she has been made to rise early and go to bed late ; her food has been the leavings of the master's table ; her work dirty and disagreeable ; often she has been watched as if her honesty was suspected, and her liberty has been so curtailed that what should have been her home has been converted into a prison. How can we wonder that servant girls under these conditions are "slatternly, slothful, and impudent," or that such an experience should make them inclined to seek some other means of livelihood ?

Good general servants are much sought after by families living in substantial houses and in a fairly comfortable fashion. They command wages varying from £16 to £22 a year, and resemble "the crew of the captain's gig" in Mr. Gilbert's famous "Bab Ballad," inasmuch as they have to be cook, parlor-maid, and house-maid all in one. Some servants like these places, for, though they have more work to do, they have far more freedom than it is possible to allow in large establishments ; "the general" has no kitchen warfare, at any rate, and only her mistress to please ; she has no upper servant to obey, and no "tempers" or moments of jealousy to ruffle her serenity, and she often ends in taking a genuine pride in the house and a keen interest in the family,

sharing their triumphs and sorrows after her own honest, hearty fashion.

The servants employed by the wealthy middle families and "the upper ten thousand" are not badly paid, and they are certainly not badly treated. When domestic service in England is compared with the position of needlewomen, compositors, and telegraph and telephone operators, the showing is certainly in favor of the former in comfort; the parlor-maid is better lodged, better fed, and, although she may receive only £20 a year, it is really equivalent to £70: the money value of her improved position would far more than treble her wages if it were paid in coin. A competent "table-maid" now asks from £18 to £30 a year; a well-trained housemaid, from £16 to £25; cooks, from £20 to £60; footmen earn from £25 to £40, with suits of livery; butlers, from £50 to £80; in some houses where the butler has great responsibility, and no house-steward is kept, he receives more than £100 a year. The skilled man *chef*, of course, earns his hundreds, while the modest kitchen maid welcomes from £10 to £18. The wages of housekeepers vary from £30 to £50 in private families; the head nurse and the lady's maid receive from £20 to £35; and in certain quarters still higher salaries are given. Mrs. Crawshay's scheme for "lady helps" has not been at all generally adopted. I have always advocated the employment of a lady in the nursery: the advantage to the children in health, manners, and morals would be of immense gain to any household rich enough to afford it, and by such means we might help to stamp out the foolish notion that there is any social degradation in domestic service.

One of the trials of the English housekeeper who has a large retinue under her command is the servant who is always on the defensive respecting her individual rights and place. "I keep to my bargain; let other people keep to theirs," is her obstinate cry, and she refuses to lend a hand outside her "own work," no matter who may suffer. The most obliging and civil servants I have ever met with are those employed by royalty and in aristocratic houses. While the "little middle-class snob" treats her servants with curtness, the well-bred woman of rank accepts their services with courtesy and grace; although she knows she has a perfect right to command them, *noblesse oblige*, and she has the self-respect which naturally accords the respect due to dependents.

The late outcry against servants strikes me as somewhat unfair and uncalled for. The prize given by Messrs. Cassell in connection with *The Quiver*, about three years ago, proved that the 1,500 servants who competed for it had lived from ten to upwards of twenty years in the same family. My own sister has a nurse who has been in her household for forty years—ever since her eldest son was born; another friend has had the same housemaid for more than twenty-five years and a coachman for fifteen; and many others tell me of servants who have lived with them for periods extending from twelve to twenty years. While we sigh for the good old-fashioned servants who gave their employers “the heart service alone worth having,” we are apt to forget the changes which have taken place in social life, the results of which are stamped as deeply on the servants as on ourselves. If restless ambition and discontent prevail in the kitchen, we must not overlook the fact that they first invaded the drawing-room. Nor can we be blind to the influence exercised by the widespread love of change and dress, and our servants are keen enough to see when employers live beyond their means and “make a show,” for this generally brings about the petty screwings which press hardest on the household. But it may well be asked, “Who are the tyrants—the mistresses who desire to have reasonable rules carried out in their own houses, or the servants who want their own way in everything, and try to rule their mistresses in the bargain?”

The relation between mistress and maid would be undoubtedly improved if the former had a more practical knowledge of household duties. Many of “our daughters” marry young and in utter ignorance of the management of a house: if middle-class girls knew something about domestic economy, the pockets of struggling husbands would be spared and many a domestic breeze avoided. I am now alluding to the mistresses who “run their own households”: the aristocracy know but little of their servants—save their personal attendants—and complain still less.

The monotony and restrictions which surround the life of the ordinary servant have given rise to most of the objections which have been raised against the occupation. “To clean herself” after a hard day’s work and sit down to needlework, or to the more exciting recreation afforded by *The Family Herald*, is scarcely exhilarating enough for the modern servant, and the joy

of the alternate "Sunday out" and the occasional holiday is spoilt by the hour fixed for the enforced return. The parlor-maid hears her young ladies talking at the dinner table of the delightful play they have seen the night before, and she is naturally inspired with a wish to see it herself; but this is impossible if the door is to be barred at 10 o'clock, especially as she has to find her way home in an omnibus, for which she probably has to wait half an hour when the play is over. The truth is that mistresses, as a rule, have not yet accepted a condition to which men in command of others have long since bowed—that pleasure and personal liberty in moderation must be accorded when the day's work is done. Servants are mostly young women in the prime of life, with all the instincts of youth full upon them, and it is cruel to ignore their social needs. Their followers and visitors are not welcome to those in authority, and therefore less objection should be raised to their occasional efforts to obtain the companionship of their own class outside the house when their work is done.

I fear we must own to another fault in dealing with our servants: women scold and nag in a way which is unknown to men who are really fit to rule. They listen to the gossip of other servants, and almost lie in wait for the suspected delinquent. A wise master knows the value of sometimes shutting his eyes, and will certainly let a good employee have time to recover himself before he attempts any expostulation. The ordinary mistress unfortunately summons the servant before she has controlled her own temper, and the result is disastrous to both. If once "a hostile attitude" describes the relation between the drawing-room and the kitchen, a state of constant friction must ensue.

I do not ignore the trials experienced by the mistresses of untrained servants: too often a succession of wasteful, ignorant girls pass, like phantasmagoria, across the threshold, leaving, however, a very convincing proof of their reality in the wreck of kitchen utensils, china, and other household treasures. Where large establishments are kept, young servants are carefully taught their separate duties; but it is a deplorable fact that girls who have passed the fifth board-school standard are often incapable of lighting a fire, or of washing a wine-glass without breaking it. They can read the "penny dreadful," but they cannot darn their stockings or mend their clothes. The want of technical train-

ing is the disadvantage which has threatend to make servants a failure ; but our board schools are now waking up to their responsibilities; they have begun to include needlework and cooking in their list of subjects, and I hope they will shortly add laundry and house work.

Mrs. Darwin appears to think that the mistress who demands a formal character of the servant should be willing to furnish one respecting herself. She writes in *The Nineteenth Century* :

“Every mistress should choose a referee, or two referees, among her servants past or present, who have been with her not less than two years ; she should give the names and addresses of these two referees to the servant whom she is inclined to engage before she writes for her character from her last mistress. . . . I cannot imagine any reasonable objection to this plan. If carried largely into practice, it could become the test of any theory about domestic service. Mistresses could then gather statistics and make generalizations as to the situations which were most highly recommended and most sought after by the best and most competent of servants. It might also put spirit into the custom of character-giving, which is said by some to be so formal. Personally, I have never found it so. It puts a vast amount of irresponsible power into the hands of one fallible human being ; and though I think it may rarely be abused, it adds tremendously to the unnecessary and injurious dependence of servants.”

This novel idea has partially been indorsed by the Hon. Maud Stanley, whose work and experience certainly entitle her to speak with authority. I confess I cannot think the plan likely to promote the cordial relations we are all anxious to secure ; nor do I follow Mrs. Darwin in her argument that domestic service has necessarily a deteriorating effect on the character. The very nature of it makes it depend upon the individual character on both sides, and no arbitrary external rules will ever bring about a satisfactory improvement.

On the whole, I do not believe that there ever was a time when servants in England were better treated and better fed and allowed more liberty than at present : they might, perhaps, be better lodged, for English architects seem to have thought but little of the rooms servants would have to work and sleep in, and the condition of some of our handsomest city houses is not without reproach in this direction. Perhaps some day this may be remedied, when women's attention is turned to the interior arrangements of our houses. Miss Charlotte Robinson (Home Art Decorator to Her Majesty) is already helping us to make our

homes beautiful, and the aid of feminine domestic mechanical engineers who will help us to overcome the difficulties by which domestic machinery is still surrounded, and the feminine architect who will not sacrifice everything to the drawing-room and dining-room, will be most acceptable to all who wish to secure the health and comfort of the entire household. Some servants at present live below the ground and sleep under the slates, or have to be content with a turn-up bedstead among the black beetles and cockroaches which disport themselves in the pantry.

There is, however, but little wanton neglect of servants nowadays, nor do I think servants are less industrious or more incompetent than in the days of our "forebears." The infirmities of humanity and the spirit of the age are not likely to be confined to one section of society : all classes have been more or less seized by this restless craving for change and not unnatural wish to "better themselves." Good mistresses, as a rule, still manage to get good servants, who are not in a hurry to leave them ; the English servant may consider herself well off compared to other wage-earning women, and, provided she does not squander her wages on dress, she is able, while living in comfort, to save sufficient money to provide either for marriage or old age.

EMILY FAITHFULL.

LOAFING AND LABORING.

BY THE LATE EDWIN P. WHIPPLE.

A PHILOSOPHER has divided human beings into two classes, namely, benefactors and malefactors. It would, perhaps, be a more comprehensive classification to divide them into laborers and loafers, for in whichever direction we look we find the class that loafs more or less undoing the beneficent work of the class that labors. The laborers brought us out of the primitive woods ; the loafers would have been content to run wild in them forever. To the laborers we owe civilization ; to the loafers, most of the evil that disfigures it. From the tilling of the soil to the tilling of the soul, through all arts, occupations, and professions, the man who shirks his task is the great disorganizer. Lands run to waste and men go to ruin, policies fail and battles are lost, literature ceases to inspire and churches to save, simply because, by some trick of fortune, the idler loafs into the laborer's place, and saunters through duties whose proper performance demands the full energies of the body and mind. The right man in the right place!—oh, if we could always have him ! The wrong man in the right place!—is not that too often our exasperating experience ?

But even when the loafer is too indolent to go through positive duties in a negative way, when he spares the world the hypocrisy of undertaking to perform any of its real business, it is still the fatality of his condition that he can assume activity only to prosecute some scheme of vice and mischief. Life without serious work is life deprived of all vigor but that which comes out in fits and starts of depravity. The loafer is thus ever a curse to others ; but then Providence has so bound up our duties to society with our own happiness that no man can be a curse to others without also being a curse to himself.

If we explore the causes of loaferism in human nature, we shall find that they are reducible to one, namely, imbecility of will,

feebleness of personality. Oh, if we could only realize what is meant by that simple phrase, "force of will"! There is something strangely inspiring in every example of its resolute exercise. Take, for example, Balzac, the renowned French romancer. "When," he says, "I took my modest apartment in Paris, I had heavy debts to discharge—something like 50,000 francs; and what had I to face them with? Nothing but a ream of paper, a bundle of quills, a penknife, a bottle of ink, my youth, AN IRON WILL, and a robust energy to overcome all difficulties and break through all obstacles." Of course, in the end he succeeded.

And the "bundle of quills" and the "bottle of ink" were the only visible capital with which the great master-workman in contemporary English romance started on that wonderful career of creative industry by which he peopled the imagination of the world with the products of his shaping brain and beneficent heart. Among the qualities of Charles Dickens, force of will was the one power which made all his other powers efficient. Without that, the intensely-conceived and patiently-elaborated characters which have added so much to our knowledge of men and so much to our love of men, which have provoked so much human laughter and drawn forth so many purifying tears, would have died, like an opium-eater's dreams, in the mind where they had their birth, instead of spreading over the earth to melt, inspire, and gladden the souls worthy to receive them. It is the laboring man in the field of literary creation that I here desire specially to celebrate, and the protest which Charles Dickens has made, by precept, characterization, and example, against all forms of loafing.

Man has been defined as an intelligence served by organs. It would be more exact to say that he is a personality served by intelligence and using organs. The will, the power of self-direction, that which individualizes a human being, which constitutes him a person who can say "I" and "my"—this is his essential characteristic, and this makes him a laborer. The indolent self-surrender of the person to the impulse or caprice of the moment, the lack of intelligent object in life, the slow fading-away of strength at the heart of his being, and his consequent disposition to drift with the stream of things rather than to guide their course—this is what dehumanizes a man, and makes him a loafer. It is only hard to be a laborer because it is hard to be a man.

Effort, inward energy, power of will, being thus the distinguishing attribute of manhood, or, rather, selfhood, the fatigue which comes from overwork is not so intolerable to bear as the listlessness which torments the wretch who is sunk in the "sleepy drench" of laziness; and, in our present state, the practical fall of man is his fall from a worker into an idler. However much our desire may be for ease, our real happiness is in activity; yet the difficulty of urging body and mind into effort is so great that the ideal of many working people is still inactive enjoyment—an ideal which their very nature makes impossible of realization. How many men there are, farmers, mechanics, merchants, lawyers, who labor vigorously, looking forward hopefully to the time when the results of their labor will enable them to be loafers!

The thought, indeed, is carried beyond the present life. Miss Marsh, in one of her novels, tells us of a British "navvy" saying to his mate: "I wonder, Bill, whether it be true what they say of heaven being so happy—whether it can be happier than sitting here in the public over a jug of ale, with the fiddle going? I don't know a pleasure as comes up to that!" And by how many persons higher in the mental and moral scale than this navvy is Paradise conceived of as a state in which there is an everlasting continuance of pious laziness,—as if the worst impiety, in heaven as on earth, was not slothful inaction!

But man, being, as I have said, essentially an active being, he must find in activity his joy as well as his duty and glory. And labor, like everything else that is good, is its own exceeding great reward. It is sanitary. Guizot, the great French statesman, said at a meeting of his friends: "After my sudden downfall, in February, 1848, I resolved to drown my grief by hard work. I preserved myself, as it were, in hard work; and it made me again wonderfully hale, active, and vigorous." "Every man's task," says Emerson, "is his life-preserver." Remember that, and you will never fret at unremunerated, unrecognized, unrecorded, even unbelieving-in toil. The moment, indeed, the first indisposition to labor is overcome by personal effort, the power to work gradually grows into a habit of working, until at last the exercise of will becomes instinctive and almost automatic. The man possesses his appetites, passions, and intelligence, and is not, like the loafer, possessed by them. He is the master, and not the slave, of his belongings. By continued effort he obtains the manliest of all feel-

ings, the feeling of personal efficiency, and he thus not only gets a living but gets *life*. The result of his labor may not be the acquisition of any great amount of wealth or any extended stores of knowledge, but it will surely be an integrity of character without which wealth is as poor as poverty and knowledge as blind as ignorance. Only let him start with the truth that labor of some kind is a good in itself, independent of its success in obtaining the object desired, and he will never think his time has been wasted because his ambition has been thwarted. He will find that he has been building up *himself*, though the airy edifice of his hopes may have tumbled into "cureless ruin," and that he is more man than he was, though less rich or famous than he counted on being.

Now, of all nations in the world, the United States should be the most intolerant to loafers and the most hospitable to laborers, from whatever land they come. Our country is, and is to be, the great field of the laborer, for its undeveloped natural resources exceed those of all other countries, and it needs the work of every head and hand, of every soul and body, in its wide domain. Our mission is to educate men for work, and not for the shirking of work. Whatever may be said of us, let it never be said that we are a loafing nation. Loafing nations are those in which the customs, habits, religion of a people invite misgovernment, and misgovernment reacts on the national character further to enfeeble and deprave it. India is a loafing nation; her chief religion, Brahminism, is simply loafing spiritualized, and her population of a hundred and fifty millions is held in subjection by a handful of English soldiers and civilians in consequence of the fact that, like the poor mother of little Paul Dombey, she will not, or cannot, "make an effort." Turkey is a loafing nation. Whole provinces which now, under Ottoman rule, are sterile and poor, were formerly among the richest dependencies of the Roman Empire; and Turkey is "the sick man" of European diplomacy because Turkey is a synonyme of arrogant laziness, superstition, and ignorance. Spain is a loafing nation—a nation ruined by a series of loafing monarchs and loafing prime ministers, of loafing tyrants and no less loafing liberals, and exhibiting what remains to it of political life only in spasms of insurrection, which lead to few or no results in good government.

Our "poor whites" at the South have long enjoyed the reputation, as a body, of thinking it more honorable to loaf than to

labor. It was at first feared that the negroes would also aspire to the honors of loafdom when they were emancipated, but that fear has been happily dispelled by experience ; and, indeed, it was hardly reasonable to predict that the race which had done nearly all the work of the South would become idlers the moment they were offered wages for working.

In strong contrast to the loafing are the laboring nations. Compare Turkey, for example, with Holland or Belgium. Holland has been won from the sea at an expense in diking of some fifteen hundred millions of dollars ; its territory is only about 12,000 square miles, or less than half of the area of South Carolina ; and yet it supports a population of three millions and a half. Its fens, bogs, and sandy heaths have been converted by industry and thrift into fertile fields and smiling meadows, and the revenue of the kingdom is forty-five millions of dollars. Belgium, with an area of about 12,500 square miles, a population of five millions, a revenue of thirty millions, is really a mere sandbank, which the labor of its inhabitants has transformed into the garden of Europe. Both countries have been repeatedly devastated by wars of long duration, and each is now burdened with the expense of an army as large in proportion to its population as that of France or Austria. The Turkish Empire in Europe and Asia is over 600,000 square miles in extent, includes provinces of immense natural fertility, is rich in every element of wealth which nature can lavish on ungrateful man ; and yet it cannot support, in squalor and ignorance, a seventh part of the population to the square mile of territory which Belgium and Holland support in comparative comfort and intelligence. So much for the difference between a nation that loafs and a nation that labors !

But while there is little danger that our country will descend to the level of Turkey and Spain, we can still draw many lessons of skill, industry, and economy from Belgium and Holland. The peculiar advantage of American labor is that, owing to the immense extent and exhaustless undeveloped resources of the country, population here does not press on subsistence as it does on the most industrious European countries. Our population is but little more than the population of Great Britain and Ireland ; but the area of Great Britain and Ireland is only 125,000 square miles, while the area of the United States is 3,480,000 square miles, without counting in Walrussia. The coal regions of the

United States alone cover a space larger by 100,000 square miles than the whole area of the United Kingdom, and yet the latter mines four times more millions of tons of coal a year than we do. But it is evident that the natural resources of Great Britain have a limit, while ours are practically unlimited.

The difficulty with England, as compared with this country, is its restricted area. Population there has increased with the increase of wealth, and it has no outlet but in emigration. The connection of this increased population with the progress of mechanical invention is quite striking. The England of Elizabeth, the England of Shakespeare, Bacon, Spenser, Raleigh, and Sidney, the England of the year 1600, contained less than four millions of people. In 1801 it contained a little more than nine millions of people. In 1861 it contained 20,228,497 people, its population more than doubling in sixty years. The England of Elizabeth had about the population of the State of New York; the England of Victoria has two-thirds of the population of the United States. The area of territory is the same, namely, 58,600 square miles—less by about 8,000 square miles than that of the State of Missouri. It is the labor and inventive genius of her people which enable her to support four times the population that she did when she was called “merrie England.”

But the special increase of her population from 1801 to 1861, amounting to eleven millions, and the increase in national wealth which such an increase in population implies, were not due to the wisdom of her statesmen or the skill of her generals,—not to Pitt, Fox, Grenville, Liverpool, Wellington, Canning, Grey, Russell, Palmerston; but to the genius of her inventors and engineers,—to Watt, Arkwright, Hargreaves, Bramah, Maudsley, Brindley, Davy, Cartwright, and Stephenson,—who created wealth faster than statesmen and generals could destroy it. In ancient times such men would have been deified; now the historian honors them with less space than he devotes to a Parliamentary debate or to a description of a skirmish; and the capitalist who thrives by them is apt to be of the opinion of that wealthy ironmonger who told Dr. Percy, in reference to inventors, that “brains were more abundant than capital, and ought therefore to be had cheap.”

Now, the inventors I have mentioned, and their successors, have added to the productive force of England an amount of mechanical power which is equivalent to the manual labor of

five hundred millions of men ; so that, if you should compute the labor-doing machines as laborers, you might say that the England of Elizabeth had a population of four millions, and the England of Victoria a population of five hundred and twenty millions, as, in addition to the twenty millions that are to be lodged, fed, clothed, and educated, there are five hundred millions that only require for food a little coal, that can lodge by the ten thousand in one little room, and whose education consists in the contrivances of their human overseers to double or treble their working capacity. Much as has been said regarding the misery of the English working classes, it must still be admitted that England supports twenty millions of people in more comfort than she supported nine millions in 1800 and four millions in 1600. The poorer classes are not indebted for their poverty altogether to the low rate of wages ; the low rate of morals has its share in it.

Still, I would not underrate the poverty of English workmen, owing to the pressure of population on subsistence. But suppose that England, with only the population she had two hundred years ago, had the mechanical aids and agencies of the present century. That is about our condition, and that gives the American laborer a peculiar, an unparalleled, advantage over his brethren of the old world. All the inventions of the past serve him ; all the best inventive wits of the present time are contriving, night and day, new machines to supplement or supplant his roughest toil, and to demand more and more work from his brain and less and less from his muscles. He is a citizen of a country in which unskilled labor is better remunerated than the skilled labor of Europe ; and skilled labor, as a general thing, is better paid than the labor of the majority of lawyers, doctors, and clergymen. The only fear is that competition will not here be sufficiently active to be educational ; for it is the amount of mind which a man puts into his work which determines its dignity and its value ; and to stimulate an unskilled workman with the ambition to be a skilled one should be the first object of our popular institutions. That handicraftsman, says Smiles, "whose heart is in his calling, feels as much honest pride in turning out a piece of thoroughly good workmanship as the sculptor or painter does in executing a statue or a picture." When the artisan has thus the feeling of the artist, he finds in his work his

recreation and his joy ; and he shows also that he is on the road which has been travelled by the great inventors and heroes of industry.

We may, I suppose, take it for granted that, whatever may be the laws, and however our American society may be organized, there will always remain in some hands a certain portion of the products of labor not devoted to the reproduction of wealth. The way this should be spent is often curtly decided by the maxim that a man has a right to do what he pleases with his own. Well, what a man will do with his own will depend somewhat on his understanding of the word happiness. There was once a hard-working blacksmith who was so *unlucky* as to draw a prize of \$20,000 in a lottery. Immediately leaving his work, he threw himself into that vortex of vicious dissipation which is ironically styled "having a good time"; but just as the good time had brought him to death's door, his money was fortunately exhausted. Returning to his old occupation and frugal habits, he recovered his health and his spirits. Soon after, as chance would have it, he drew another prize. "Oh, bother the luck!" he exclaimed, in the greatest trepidation; "have I got to go through all that thing again?" This story is representative. Those who draw the prizes of life are but too apt to spend tastelessly when they do not spend viciously. Their money goes for wine, dogs, and horses ; for upholstery as ugly as it is gorgeous ; for houses which make good the Frenchman's epigram, that the genius of architecture has shed her malediction on America. They have not learned that it requires as much talent to spend as to make money ; that wealth and leisure are only valuable as means of education and refinement ; that the best investments a man can make are investments in intelligence and beneficence ; that an artistic sense should guide the expenditure of surplus income, and that it should be expressed in pictures and statues, in good music, in good books, in good charities, in houses designed according to some law of beauty, in furniture showing some perception of the elegant and the appropriate.

In doing what he pleases with his own, a man should look out to find no pleasure in expensive deformity, and while he works with his active capital he should not loaf with his inactive wealth. All good things in the fine arts tend to react on industry by elevating it or elevating the man ; and all exercise of the mind and

sentiments in the cultivation of taste, the acquisition of knowledge, and the appreciation of what is beautiful and good, is but a finer kind of work. Any young lady will tell you that her French, her Italian, her music, her behavior, in short, her general power to please, came from her power to toil. Indeed, what are called accomplishments, whether in man or woman, are the spoils of strenuous exertion; and they are only bad when they degenerate into dilettantism, which is but another name for artistic loafing.

This antithesis between loafing and laboring might be extended so as to include all the departments of activity over which intellect holds dominion, comprising generalship, statesmanship, literature, science, and art. The act of thought by which the general selects his enemy's weak point, by which the statesman seizes his opportunity, by which the poet creates, the savant discovers, the artist combines, is the culmination of about the hardest work done on the planet—the work of creative genius.

Strong and quick intelligence, indeed, is the result of the vital assimilation of large acquisitions into mental faculties; and it was the oversight of this fact which caused the typical bright young man "who went off to make his fortune out of his wits" to fail "for want of capital." Buffon, the great naturalist, who had, says Saint-Beuve, "the soul of a sage in the body of an athlete," who said of himself that he had passed fifty years of his life at his writing-table, and who thought it an imputation on his intellectual character that another should understand what he could not understand himself, defined genius as patience—that is, the capacity of continuous labor, "unhasting" but "unresting." Sixteen hours of work a day were as little to him and to Cuvier as they were to Agassiz. In literature we can instinctively distinguish an author's works from his loafings, the clear sky of his mind from its muggy weather.

Napoleon, for example, was a prodigious toiler, though the rapidity with which he worked gave to his labor the appearance of inspiration. What we call his flashes of genius, what we call his intuitive glance, came from his previous mastery of all the principles and minutest details relating to the business before him; came from the fierce energy of will which carried him through masses of drudgery from which ordinary industry would

have shrunk appalled. His victories were won in his mind before they occurred in the field.

Among our own generals, Sheridan, in the recent Civil War, made his great mark on the public mind by the impression he conveyed of ceaseless activity of body and soul. He seemed to be a thought on horseback, that toil could not fatigue nor bullets hit, with the power to flash its own ardor and intelligence through the ranks of the army it led. As vigilant as he was audacious; as skilful as he was intrepid; with his mind intently fixed on the business he had to do, and determined to do it, obstacles quickened rather than dismayed his intellect, and seeming hopelessness of success only stimulated his exhaustless fertility of contrivance. He was considered to be rash merely because there was no pause between his swiftly-conceived plan and swiftly-delivered blow, because the brain that thought was in such direct communication with the arm that smote. He knew that he might be killed, but he had that in him which he felt could not be defeated. As he was riding with his escort,—not with the melodramatic celerity we are accustomed to believe, but with the usual pace of some six miles an hour,—as he was riding, I say, from Winchester to Cedar Creek on that memorable morning when he was “twenty miles away,” he quietly remarked to Colonel Alexander, as the reports of the disaster to his army came pouring in: “I am determined to regain that field before nightfall, or lie on it.” And at Five Forks, in the great closing battle of the war, his mind was so intent on his work that he appeared to be entirely unconscious that he had a body subject to be pierced by a ball or shattered by a shell.

An inspiration to the faltering, a greater terror to the cowardly than the enemy from whom they desired to fly, he was not only the bravest of the brave, but the most skilful of the skilful; and his perceptions were as keen, his judgment as true, his thinking as just, while giving his orders in the midst of that tempest of bullets, as they would have been had no danger to his person interfered with the calm working of his mind. I might contrast such a laboring commander with some of the loafing generals of the war, but, happily for them, they are already forgotten, and their names wake no echoes, even of shame and scorn.

Moral loafing is the characteristic of a large class of people, whose understandings assent to the truth of moral laws, whose sympathies are slightly stirred in admiration of the beauty of moral conduct, and whose hearts feel a certain indignation at the spectacle of rascality, baseness, and oppression, but who still have no moral *verve* and might. To get such persons thoroughly on fire with moral energy is like attempting to light wet wood with newspapers. They find a lazy enjoyment in harmonizing their opinions with what is noble and just; but it is moral self-indulgence they are after, not moral self-sacrifice. They loaf for great causes, not labor for them. Their sympathies, thus divorced from action, soon become misdirected and unwholesome. If they take a languid interest, for example, in any large plans of criminal reform, it gradually degenerates into a morbid pity for the criminal, in which they lose all horror of crime.

In a letter written by John Randolph to Josiah Quincy, Randolph says: "We are so full of the ass's milk of human kindness that we shall soon learn to speak of Judas Iscariot as an *unfortunate* man." This ass's milk is now consumed at too many philanthropic tea-tables, and "iniquitous" makes desperate attempts to pass itself off as a synonyme of "unfortunate." Jefferson Davis was an "unfortunate" rebel; Wilkes Booth, an "unfortunate" assassin. There are some hearts that instinctively feel for the arrested criminal rather than for his plundered or murdered victim. Duncan being in his grave and "sleeping well," all their benevolence is extended to poor Macbeth, whose repose, they hear, is troubled with bad dreams, and whose waking hours are vexed with strange "sights."

But in the moral laborer sympathies have passed into the intellect as principles, and into the conscience as motives, to come out through the will as acts. True philanthropy demands hard, rugged, uncomfortable, distasteful drudgery. It seizes on the real evils of the country, evils which are obstructing its progress, weakening its character, brutalizing its manners, poisoning its soul, and it declares on them open war. It is alert, sagacious, persisting, indefatigable, intrepid, pouring incessantly into the national life its stream of moral influences. It amazes the moral loafer by its inextinguishable ardor in the pursuit of homely, practical ends. Coleridge, a loafing man of genius, whose mind was especially hospitable to theological questions, once wondered if

Clarkson, in his untiring efforts against the slave trade, had ever found time to think of the salvation of his soul. The idling amateur theosophist did not appear to reflect that Clarkson was saving his own soul by devoting his life to the salvation of others—that heaven is on earth with every heroic philanthropist who, while on earth, is engaged in fighting hell.

Finally, we must remember that it is moral labor which reacts on all other labor, by giving that increased force to the will on which all labor ultimately depends. Even in the matter of industrial production, its great enemies all over the world are indolence, improvidence, insobriety, dishonesty, perversity, as its stout supports are frugality, forethought, temperance, integrity, obedience to duty. Every man would have enough and to spare if the loafers would turn laborers, and, instead of being a burden on the community, should add to its wealth. Shiftlessness, laziness, and rascality lay the most grinding of all taxes on industry and rectitude. They do not merely represent that pauperism of body which can be stowed away in almshouses, but that wider pauperism of soul, that willingness to depend for support on the exertions of others instead of their own, which withdraws millions from the producing classes by killing in them the producing disposition and faculty. Now, such persons may be said to *exist*, but they cannot be said to *live*, for there is not much difference between “to be and not to be” until To Be has passed into To Do!

E. P. WHIPPLE.

A NEW VARIETY OF MUGWUMP.

BY THE HON. DORMAN B. EATON, FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF
THE CIVIL-SERVICE COMMISSION.

MR. CLARKSON, for eighteen months an Assistant Postmaster-General under President Harrison, in an article entitled "The Politician and the Pharisee," in the May number of this REVIEW, has labored hard to redeem the politician and discredit the Mugwump, but has succeeded only in presenting a new species of Mugwump.

The article condemns the national administration. It arraigns the President and his cabinet for not making more removals. It makes the politician and the *boss* the only patriots. It threatens the Republican party with ruin in 1892 unless it shall adopt the theories of these new Mugwumps. It misconceives and misrepresents the first century of our national history. It echoes the voice of the defeated Senator from Kansas by sneering at reform and representing all reformers as canting hypocrites. It makes the Pharisee the representative, not only of the old Mugwumps, but of all citizens above the mere politician and the partisan. It declares, without warrant, that these citizens discourage interest in political affairs, when, in truth, they have been most active in such affairs, and their efforts have caused more study, discussion, and scrutiny of the methods and theories of government and parties than ever before took place in our history. It invites the enlightened readers of this REVIEW to approve those most responsible for the political barbarism of expelling probably 20,000 postmasters from their places in eighteen months, and to condemn the President and his cabinet, who had the wisdom to arrest such disastrous proscription. The article appeals to those readers to aid the new Mugwumps in making supreme the power of the politicians under whose sway the scandalous scenes of those months would become the constant and intolerable condition of our politics.

In an article so ambitious we naturally expect to find not only some explanation on those points, but some sensible, or at least some definite, views upon the striking tendencies of public sentiment within its scope and at the time before us. We look for them in vain. Few things, for example, are so striking in our politics as the rapid growth and majestic power of public opinion, as contrasted with mere party opinion. Yet our author apparently takes no note of public opinion as a political force, party opinion, in his view, being universal and supreme. The increased influence of the independent or non-partisan press of the country—now so overshadowing the mere partisan journals as to make many of them contemptible—is one of the hopeful wonders of our time. Party contests are in large part but efforts to win this public opinion. This it is which mere politicians most dread and least understand. For nearly a generation public opinion has been growing stronger and stronger, as rapidly as mere party opinion has been growing weaker and weaker, as a political force. Why did not our author tell us how all this has happened? It is absolutely necessary to comprehend public opinion before we can understand how civil-service reform has steadily advanced despite the opposition of mere party opinion and politicians.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, or any other of first rank, would sink in hopeless ruin in a year—as would the Republican party itself—if it should adopt the new party politics of Mr. Clarkson's article. He has come into its columns to appeal to the favor of that overmastering, non-partisan public opinion which he dreads, and which he knows no mere party publication can reach. If he believed party journals and party opinion were the dominating force, why did he make his appeal beyond them? Unfortunately for his cause, he did not comprehend that it was as needful to abandon the arguments, the threats, and the sophistries of the mere politicians as to go outside of their journals; and as a consequence, we must believe, he has repelled rather than convinced his readers. He has advanced a theory of the early years of the republic as repugnant to every chapter of its history as the mere politician was offensive to its statesmen.

The only explanation he offers of the increasing power of public opinion and of the non-partisan press is that the powerful independent journals have been bought up—that is, bribed—to abandon the Republicans and support the Democrats; certainly an

astonishing charge to be made without the least proof. Is it really believed that scores of editors of Republican journals are so corrupt as to thus betray their party? that scores of thousands of intelligent Republican readers are so ignorant or so depraved that they can be thus transferred to the ranks of their opponents by the mere treachery of such editors?

Another great problem passed over in silence is the reason why the movement and the law of 1883 for the reform of the civil service have been all the while steadily gaining strength, and were never so effective as at this moment. The article is to the last degree hostile to both. The reformers are ranked by it in the lowest grade of the Pharisees. The politicians, whom it eulogizes as models of virtue and mighty in power, have constantly but vainly opposed both the law and its execution. Why has this opposition so ignominiously failed? What is the source of the irresistible power demanding reform?

While in a vague way many indefensible opinions and purposes are charged or insinuated against the supporters of this reform, its essential principles are nowhere met by argument, and there is not so much as an attempt to answer the evidence of its great usefulness, which has commanded the support of every administration and every Congress, whether Democratic or Republican. The Republican politicians were certain it would fail when the Democrats succeeded to power; yet they increased its scope. Why did our author evade this great issue? He was called upon to explain such facts in consistency with his theories. He has not so much as attempted a denial of the great facts that the reform has brought more competent officers into the public service, has been highly favorable to education and manly character, has greatly diminished the sphere and evil of office-seeking, has increased the efficiency of every office to which it has been applied, has put most salutary checks upon congressional patronage-mongering.

That it condemns and largely prevents the prostitution of the appointing power for mere party ends, and the establishment of partisan despotism under the control of mere politicians and *bosses*, is very certain. It—the merit system of office—has opened the way for young men to come into the public service on the basis of their character and capacity, whatever selfish politicians, whether in Congress or out, may do or say. It largely suppresses

congressional patronage and takes away the spoils of the politicians within the whole range of the examinations, thus giving to honest worth what intrigue and base influence had before largely monopolized. There is far more liberty for removing the unfit under the reform system than there was before ; for no vicious partisan influence gave the officer his place or is at hand to keep him in it. By his own merits he won his position ; by his good service alone he can keep it, if only spoilsmen in high places can be held in check. No politician will aid him, for the politician aids only his favorites. The merit system is in no way hostile to true parties, but rather favors and strengthens them by relieving them of the demoralizing effects of partisan office-seeking. It opens the way for the free and manly support of great principles, which is the paramount function of a true political party. The merit system tends to increase the freedom of the people to choose all elective and representative officers, from those of towns and villages to the President himself. The charge made by our author that the people's control of local affairs is invaded is a strange delusion. The election of lawmakers, the work of legislation, and the approval and disapproval of bills by the President and governors are the great and true spheres of party action and influence ; and with none of these does the reform system interfere. It deals mainly with the abuse of the appointing power and with the invasion of executive functions by venal politicians and patronage-mongering legislators, who therefore hate it.

In Congress and in State legislatures its effect is to discourage and to a large extent arrest the unconstitutional and disastrous interference with executive affairs by legislative officers. To legislators are thus allowed more time and liberty for their true functions, and executive officers are left free to do their work. Both houses of Congress have apparently taken this view of the matter by voting year by year increased appropriations for carrying on the reform. When the new Mugwumps in Congress attacked the reform last winter, they were repulsed most disastrously.

Prior to his election as President, Mr. Harrison had not been very radically committed to this reform. Secretaries Tracy and Noble, perhaps, had hardly favored it. The Postmaster-General was possibly half as hostile to it as our author himself. If the Postmaster-General is not yet as complete a convert to the merit system as the public interest requires that he should be,—and as

we may believe he will some years hence wish he had been,—he at least appears to be very widely separated from his late subordinate. The President and his cabinet have not only sustained, but have extended, the reform. The examinations now cover many more offices than they did when President Harrison was inaugurated—a fact as creditable to himself and his cabinet as it is auspicious for the Republican party. Secretary Tracy, with the courage of his recent convictions, has enforced its principles in several of the navy-yards, and is now extending this application. Secretary Noble has promoted the extension of the merit system to the Indian service. The President himself has enlarged its sphere and suppressed opportunities of evading it. These statesmen obviously believe that by supporting this reform they best serve their country, and also do the most in their power to strengthen their party. They comprehend that public opinion would be shocked and certain ruin would await the Republican party should it now abandon the reform policy it has had the chief part in establishing. There are now more than 32,000 offices beyond the control of scheming politicians and patronage-mongers—offices which can be secured only by public competitive examinations as to capacity and character. More than 86,000 persons have been examined for filling places thus taken out of spoils-system politics and made the rewards of superior merit. It is no wonder that selfish politicians and bosses, who care more for patronage than for principle, are hostile, angry, and alarmed.

The ex-Assistant Postmaster-General, alone among those in high place under the present or any previous Republican administration, has reached different conclusions. This is clearly his right. He may have had considerable justification for his attack on the President, if a stern rejection of ruinous theories can be a justification. But can he fairly ask both houses of Congress, his own party, which has so long supported the reform, the President, and all the members of his cabinet, to come over to his view, on the peril of his heading a rebellious faction of new Mugwumps in the next election? We have some doubts on this point.

And now a few words concerning the new Mugwumps themselves, as presented by their champion. The one specific, essential, and infallible proof of being a Mugwump is the assertion and exercise of the right to criticise one's party, its officers and policy.

Thus tested, the politicians—members of the new faction, if the rebellion has gone so far—whom Mr. Clarkson champions are Mugwumps of the most radical kind. The variation of the new species from the old type is as unmistakable as their specific identity. The old Mugwumps, though they have their faults, insist on keeping party pledges, on making reforms, on raising the standard for office, on obeying the higher sentiments, on having faith in public virtue and independent manhood; and for these reasons they are called idealists, star-gazers, Sunday-school politicians, and the like. The new Mugwumps are very different in these particulars. They arraign presidents and administrations for trying to fulfil pledges. They hate reforms and reformers. They would make office the reward for partisan zeal and vicious work at the elections. They have faith in manipulation and money in politics. They believe in bosses and wish nothing better than mere politicians. The old Mugwumps believe in statesmen who stand above mere politicians; in statesmen who look upon the nation as something superior to any party, and something which every party ought to serve. They believe in parties, not as an end in themselves, but as organizations which may be made effective for the support of great principles, by which the common interests and welfare of a people and a nation may be advanced. They believe in aiding parties, and do aid them so far as they are true to their principles and pledges. Fidelity to principles and usefulness to the country are, in the view of the old Mugwumps, the supreme duty and the sole justification of political parties.

Mr. Clarkson inadvertently bears testimony to the perhaps sometimes excessive efforts of the old Mugwump to make things better; for he says he “first becomes better than his party, and next better than his country.” We see no evidence that the new Mugwumps will ever sin in this way.

The new Mugwumps make direct duty to party supreme. They can feel no patriotic obligation that is not to be discharged through working for a party. In setting forth that astounding theory concerning the early days of the republic to which we have referred, it is declared that the patriot tried to make the government better “by working for his party” rather than his country. But there were no parties when the Declaration of Independence was made, when the constitution was framed, or until near the end of Washington’s administration. Were there

then no patriotism and no means by which a patriot and statesman could work for his country? Certainly there were statesmen in those times, and it has been generally believed that something was done for the country. At least, a constitution was framed, a national government was organized, the great fundamental laws were enacted, the departments were set to work, the country took its place in the family of nations,—all this without parties and under a President and statesmen who warned us of dangers from party excesses. The plain truths of history, however, do not trouble the new Mugwumps in the least. They have no more place for them than they have for statesmen. The statesman is referred to by their champion as a person whom the detested “Pharisee uses,” and to whom the new Mugwump objects, preferring the politician and the boss.

It is certainly possible to use the word politician to designate a statesman, however great the shock such use of it produces. Common use makes him the manager of party politics, the active man in the manipulation of caucuses and conventions, the astute partisan who cares more for victory than for principle, more for his party than his country. As such our author commends him to the youth of the nation as the model patriot. Even the boss himself—the great embodiment of all that is worst in the mere politician—is extolled as hardly less than a saint, a martyr. Incredible as it may seem, these are the words of his eulogist: “He [the boss] does for his party what the class-leader does for his church. . . . He does a work so good and from a motive so pure that money could not hire it done.” Such words make us laugh when we are expected to admire. Yet we agree, and rejoice, that money could not hire an honest man to do most of the work done by the boss. Far better that most of it should be left undone. What is greatly needed is much less management, much less party coercion, much less of the work of the boss in our politics, and much more free voting and free acting on the part of the citizen. It is an insult to the best elements of human nature to class mere politicians with the earnest Christian and the self-sacrificing patriot.

Throughout the land—in the churches, charities, and hospitals, and all the manifold organizations for relieving affliction and uplifting society—self-sacrificing men and women nobly labor for the welfare of their country. In all the schools, seminaries, and col-

leges ; in all the walks of science, art, and literature ; in the innumerable organizations for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge ; through books and the public press in all its forms, the higher and most unselfish thought and aspiration of the people make their grand contributions to the intelligence, character, and public opinion of the nation. In nearly every domain of human thought and effort, more largely than in that of party politics, noble and gifted men of original genius make new contributions to the higher influences by which the morality and civilization of nations are moulded and righteous government is upheld. Compared with what springs from such sources to illustrate true self-sacrifice and to make up the higher life, the soul of a nation, all that is contributed by the mere politicians and the bosses is both small and mean indeed.

Yet the expounder of the new Mugwumpism, neglecting all these great elements of national character, tells us that the "soul of the government" is put into it through politics. Religion, morality, statesmanship, as uplifting and creative forces, are unnoticed. There is no apparent conception of the power of public opinion. Party opinion, party men, party discipline, politicians, practical politics, bosses, partisan patronage, offices, the power of appointment and removal—these, according to the new Mugwumps, are what put souls into government, make republics great, determine the destiny of nations, illustrate lofty virtues, deserve the admiration of the young men of this great country. "Every good citizen is a politician," says the champion of new Mugwumpism ; therefore every one not a politician is a bad citizen. What a bad citizen Washington must have been !

It is an interesting part of the new Mugwump theories that they claim the town meeting to be the basis and guarantee of the American system of government, with which civil-service reform is utterly incompatible. Now, it is unfortunate for this view that the town meeting originated and has been most developed and best preserved in Massachusetts, the very State which has longest and most widely, and with the most salutary results, enforced that civil-service reform which Mr. Clarkson detests. It has made converts of all parties and their leaders. It is being enforced not merely in the State administration (as generally understood), but in that of the counties, cities, hospitals, asylums, and other public institutions of the State, and even in street-cleaning in Boston.

Wherever these new Mugwump theories refer to definite facts in public affairs, they are confuted and rebuked.

There is no space to set forth the degradation, corruption, and ferocity in our politics which the adoption of the new Mugwump system of universal partisan proscription would cause. No other writer has ever proposed such a system. No government could long stand under it, and none since the republics of Greece and Italy have enforced it. It requires President Harrison to fill all the new judgeships with Republican politicians. The spoils system, which was first accepted by Jackson, and disgraced his administration, was civilization itself compared with the barbarity of this new Mugwumpism. In four years Jackson needed to make hardly two thousand appointments, in the whole public service, to fill all the places which his removals and coercion caused. The enforcement of the new Mugwump system made more appointments than this necessary in four months in a single one of the seven great departments. Men now alive will be living when the country will have more than five hundred thousand postmasters. Fifteen hundred appointments every secular day for a whole year would not meet the demands of the new Mugwumps in the matter of post-offices alone, to say nothing of the vast numbers of other offices. Does any sane man think republican government could long stand such a strain?

Heretofore the most audacious and unscrupulous advocates of a partisan spoils system have tried to justify it as useful to the country. We now have it demanded in the name of the people, to gratify the "pride" of a victorious party, as Roman consuls demanded triumphs and sacrifices to gratify the pride and revenge of brutal, victorious legions. These are the astounding words: "They believe in changes . . . for the public good . . . and also from a sense of party pride"! After all the removals that the public good requires are completed, how many thousands should be added to gratify the savagery of party pride? The celebrated declaration of Marcy about the victors and the spoils is reason and moderation compared with this savage theory of removals to gratify party pride. It would disgrace the republican system and the American name even in the half-civilized countries of Asia. Could anything be more disgusting and contemptible in the next presidential campaign than a faction of Republicans avowing such a policy and seeking such a consummation?

To even compromise with such a faction would defeat any party. If such a faction takes the field, it should have for its platform an execution-block, on its flags a skull and bones, and for the baton of its boss an Australian boomerang or an Indian tomahawk.

We have no space for dealing with the preposterous claim that our early national history lends sanction to this new Mugwumpism. Nothing analogous to its party theories can be found in the national administration of the first half-century. They are as repugnant to the spirit of the early statesmen as Christianity is to heathenism. Jefferson, on succeeding a Federal President, made less than fifty removals, and he deprecated them as a necessity. In the whole forty years from Washington's election to that of Jackson there were less than a hundred removals for party reasons—not so large a number as were lately made on many single days in a single department, in trying to meet the insatiable demands of our new Mugwumps. The whole claim made that our constitution provides for party government and mere party responsibility rests on an utter misconception of its provisions. Such a government, of which that of England is the best example, requires that the victorious party should be able to control not only the executive department, but both branches of the legislature. No such result follows our elections. The President may be of one party, the Senate of another, and the House even of a third. Laws and policies must be the result of the agreement of the three, and hence much more than a mere party responsibility and control was clearly contemplated. It was plainly intended that a powerful and all-pervading public opinion should force all three branches of the government and all parties into allegiance to reason and duty. To make possible the kind of administration which this new Mugwumpism demands, we must not only repudiate the best precedents of the nation, but frame for it a new constitution.

DORMAN B. EATON.

THE INHERITANCE OF PROPERTY.

BY PROFESSOR RICHARD T. ELY, OF JOHNS HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY.

THE chief modern industrial problem is often stated to be the distribution of property. What is wanted is widely-diffused property, and it is desired to bring about this wide diffusion without injustice, and without injury to the springs of economic activity.

Many proposals are brought forward which aim to produce a more general prosperity. Two of the best-known are the single tax and socialism. These, however, apart from all other considerations, encounter the strongest obstacles to their introduction because they are so averse to powerful private interests. Wise social reform will always seek for the line of least resistance. It is granted that the end proposed by socialism and the single tax is desirable in so far as it contemplates a wide distribution of wealth ; but before committing ourselves to any extreme doctrines it is well to ask, What can be done without radical change ?—in other words, what can we accomplish in order to ameliorate the condition of the masses without departure from the fundamental principles of the existing social order ? When we reflect upon it, we find that there are many things, and that these are quite sufficient to occupy the thoughts and energies of well-wishers of their kind for a long time to come. At the present time I feel inclined to classify the chief things required to bring about an improved condition of society in the United States under three heads, namely :

First—Education in its broadest sense, including kindergartens, manual training, technical schools, colleges, and universities.

Second—The abolition of private monopoly, and the substitution therefor of public ownership and management of all those en-

terprises which are by nature monopolies, like railways, gas and electric-lighting businesses, telegraphs, telephones, etc.

Third—A reform of the laws of inheritance.

What can be done by a regulation of inheritance to change the distribution of property, and consequently of the opportunities and income which property yields? Once in a generation nearly all property changes owners, and that gives opportunity for bringing about the greatest changes within half a century. There is a perpetual flow of property from the dead to the living, and it is possible by means of law to exercise much influence over this current. When we attempt to bring about reform and improvement by a wise regulation of inheritance, we have a solid basis of experience to help us. One part of such legislation which naturally suggests itself is the taxation of the estates of decedents, and such estates are taxed to a greater or less extent in nearly all—perhaps in all—great modern nations. We may mention England, Australia, New Zealand, and Switzerland as countries with particularly instructive experience in the taxation of inheritances. Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland in the United States have experience which is valuable as far as it goes. Three of the countries named, Australia, New Zealand, and Switzerland, have taxation of inheritances which amounts to a conscious attempt to influence the distribution of property.

Some one may interrupt at this point with the objection, "You are proposing measures which impair the rights of private property." The objection is not valid. The right of inheritance is one right, and the right of private property is another and a distinct right. He has made but little progress in the fundamental principles of jurisprudence who does not see how clearly separated are these two rights. The right of property means an exclusive right of control over a thing, but the right of inheritance means the transfer of this right in one manner or another. If there is no will, it means the right of some one to succeed to property, and this right is a product of positive law. If a will is made, the right of inheritance means, not an exclusive right of control vested in a person, but the right of a person to say who shall exercise the right of property over things which were his while he was living, after he is dead, and, consequently, after he has lost all rights of property, because the dead have no proprietary rights whatever. Blackstone in his "Commentaries on

the Laws of England" clearly discriminates between the rights of property and the rights which we lump together under the designation inheritance. He says :

"Naturally speaking, the instant a man ceases to be, he ceases to have any dominion : else if he had a right to dispose of his acquisitions one moment beyond his life, he would also have a right to direct their disposal for a million of ages after him . which would be highly absurd and inconvenient. All property must, therefore, cease upon death, considering men as absolute individuals unconnected with civil society. . . . Wills, therefore, and testaments, rights of inheritance and succession, are all of them creatures of the civil or municipal laws, and accordingly are in all respects regulated by them ; every distinct country having distinct ceremonies and requisites to make a testament completely valid ; neither does anything vary more than the right of inheritance under different national establishments."

Blackstone says it is an erroneous principle to suppose that "the son has by nature a right to succeed to his father's lands," or that the owner "is by nature entitled to direct the succession of his property after his own decease."

The right of private property in itself is not an unlimited one, but is limited and regulated to an increasing extent by all modern nations. Let one but think what this right implies. It implies, among other things, my right to fence in a certain portion of the earth's surface, and to exclude others from it and use it as I see fit, subject only to such general regulations as may exist to prevent the abuse of private property. These regulations, however, as they are general in character, must always leave untouched many gross abuses. But when we come to the claim that my right of disposing of property by last will and testament is practically unlimited, it means not only my right to regulate the use of certain portions of the earth's surface, or claims to certain portions of other valuable things in this earth, during my lifetime, but for all future time. There are those, indeed, who go so far as to hold that a man may establish certain regulations for the use of property after he is dead and gone, and that these regulations must be binding upon all future generations. Could any claim be more monstrous ? It is in itself the extremest radicalism. We may say, in fact, that it is the furthest reach which radicalism has yet attained.

Nothing illustrates better the changing ideas and practices concerning inheritance than this right to make a last will and testament. Sir Henry Maine, in his "Village Communities," says : "The power of free testamentary distribution implies the greatest latitude ever given in the history of the world to the voli-

tion or caprice of the individual." The right of making a will is one which has not been generally recognized, it is safe to say, during the greater part of the world's history. Probably the vast majority—say, as a rash guess, nineteen-twentieths—of the human beings who have ever lived have not known this right. There is a legal maxim of the old Teutonic law which prevailed among our ancestors to the effect that "God, not man, makes heirs." This old Teutonic law provided that a man's property should pass to his family, and this he could not prevent if he would. This has been the most common regulation of inheritance. The Roman law brought in the right of free testamentary disposition of property; a development of individualism in keeping with many other parts of this law. The Roman law, however, had no sooner established the right of a man to dispose of his property by will and testament than it began to limit this right, and to make these limitations more and more far-reaching. The experience of other countries has been similar. No sooner do we come near an unlimited right of disposing of property by last will and testament than we begin to beat a retreat.

The modern man thinks it a right thing in itself that he should be able to tell what shall become of his property after his death, but millions of human beings have lived and died who have thought it a thing right in itself that the laws of inheritance should exclude the right to make a will. This merely illustrates the changing, fluctuating ideas concerning inheritance. In the States of the American Union for some time after our Revolutionary War, the right of the eldest son to receive a double portion of his father's estate obtained, and it was spoken of as "being according to the law of nature and the dignity of birthright." As a matter of fact, the laws of inheritance direct the disposition of most property, and they gradually so form our opinions that we look upon what they provide as naturally right, although they provide one thing in one country or state, and another thing in another country or state. It has been said that even when wills are made in modern times they as a rule do little more than carry out the provisions of the law. Perhaps there is no department of life in which law has a greater effect upon public opinion.

If it is the function of the law to regulate inheritance, what should be the purpose of the law? We may say that the law has three purposes. The first is to gratify the desire of the individ-

ual to direct the disposition of his property after his death. This, however, is altogether minor and subordinate. The dead have no legal rights, and we should not allow their wishes to interfere with the living. The second purpose of the law is the chief one, and that is the preservation and security of the family. The third purpose is the welfare of society in general ; and under this head we may say that the preservation of small properties is important, and that the idea of justice which demands that a person should make a fair return for that which he receives is one which ought to be kept in view.

Let us consider briefly the family. The Rev. Samuel W. Dike, who has made the study of the family as a social institution a specialty, complains that our laws neglect to treat the family as such, and to provide for its welfare. This is true. The modern legislator does not stop to ask the effect of proposed measures upon the family as an institution. Frequent divorces, of which we hear so much, are only one manifestation of this general neglect, the fruit of radical individualism. We have done one thing in the United States thoroughly,—we have made careful provision for the rights of the wife in the property of her husband. The law generally provides that the wife shall inherit a third, or the use of a third, of the husband's estate, and no will can lessen the wife's legal share. This is a far-reaching limitation of the right of making a will. But even when providing for the wife, the legislator seems to have regarded her rather as an individual than as a part of the family. Some States, like New York, make no adequate provision for the husband of a wife with property, allowing her to disinherit the husband, and, under certain circumstances, if she dies and leaves no will, the property will go to cousins rather than to the husband.

There has been nowhere in the United States adequate provision for children, although it might be supposed that their claims would be superior even to the claims of a wife. A wife enters into relation with her husband when she is an adult, freely and voluntarily ; but children have no choice about the relationship into which their parents bring them. The laws of some countries provide that a child must receive a certain share of the estate of a parent, and that this cannot be willed away. This share is called in the Roman law "*legitima portio*,"—legitimate part,—but the German law has a better designation for it,

“Pflichttheil”—duty part. The laws of France provide that a father with children may will away only what would be a child's share of his estate, and that the rest must be divided equally among all the children. The details of the law may vary, but it is contrary to the fundamental principles of the law to neglect to provide for children in the laws of inheritance. Those who are responsible for having brought children into the world may not presume to disinherit them. A parent's duty is to do all in his power to give his children the training and opportunities which will enable them to lead happy and useful lives. It is not desirable that children should be placed in such a position that self-exertion is rendered needless. I should say that in the United States the “duty part” of a child of even the richest parent need not exceed fifty thousand dollars, and that so far as the rest of the estate is concerned, after providing for wife and children, and after satisfying the claims of the State, that should be left subject to free disposition.

When no will is made, the rule according to which property is divided among wife and children in this country is, perhaps, tolerably satisfactory; but suppose a man dies making no will, and has only collateral relatives: what should be their legal claim upon the estate? The modern laws which provide that even distant relatives may inherit the property of intestates are survivals of an earlier period, when large family groups lived together and formed a kind of a family partnership under the authority of the patriarch. When a man died under such circumstances, it was only natural that his property should pass to the family or the clan, itself but a larger family, for all were united together by the ties of interest and affection. There was a correspondence between rights and duties. But what is the case at the present time? The peculiar ties which bind together distant relatives are practically unworthy of consideration. Rights and duties ought to be coördinate, but distant relatives recognize no special duties towards one another, and do not think about their common relationship unless there is some property to be inherited from a distant rich relative, for whom they care nothing. In the absence of a will, there is positively no reason whatever why any one should inherit from a third cousin. The family reason does not cover the case, because family feeling does not in our day extend so far, and, indeed, there is no reason why it should.

The right of inheritance, so far as relatives are concerned, should reach as far as the real family feeling does, but no farther. Intestate inheritance should include, perhaps, those who are nearly enough related so that they can trace descent from a common great-grandfather, but none who are more distantly related. This allows second cousins to inherit from one another, but not third. It allows that one may inherit from a great-uncle, but not from a great-great-uncle, and so forth. Any provision for a more distant relative should be made by will, just the same as provision for any one who is not related at all. All property which is not willed away, and does not fall to some heir recognized by law, should fall to the state as the ultimate heir.

The right of disposing of property by will and testament may be left intact—and should be so left in the public interest—with the limitations already mentioned and to be mentioned presently. After all legally-recognized claims are satisfied, it is beneficial rather than otherwise to allow a person to dispose of the rest of his estate by will, although it should be clearly recognized that this is a matter over which the law has control, and that no human being has a right to say what shall take place on this earth, or what use shall be made of anything he may leave, after he is dead and gone. It may very well happen that there are persons with moral claims upon a man who are not connected by ties of blood, or not nearly enough related to inherit property according to the laws of intestate inheritance. The only way to make provision for such special cases which justice or gratitude may point out is by will. It may also happen that among the legal heirs there may be a particular reason why one should be selected as the recipient of more than a proportionate share of the property. Take the case of four or five brothers, one of whom is a cripple, the others being strong, active, and capable: what could be more just than that the unfortunate one should receive a larger share than the others? It may also happen that of three or four daughters one has married a poor man and the others wealthy men, and the father may see good reason for equalizing their conditions. A thousand-and-one cases arise in daily life for which individual provision must be made, as they do not fall under the general rule and the law cannot provide for them. Persons of means may also properly enough leave property to educational and charitable institutions. The right to

dispose of a portion of property by will tends to the encouragement of energy and thrift.

All inheritances of every sort should be taxed, provided the share of an heir exceeds a certain amount. The state or the local political unit—as town or city—must be recognized as a co-heir entitled to a share in all inheritances. A man is made what he is by family, by town, or the local political circle which surrounds him, and by the state in which he lives, and all have claims which ought to be recognized. Taxation of inheritance is the means whereby this claim of the state and town may secure recognition. It should, however, be borne in mind that it is a peculiar tax, and rests upon a different basis from the ordinary tax. The justification which appeals to me most strongly is that the political organisms are co-heirs. There are, however, many different stand-points from which the taxation of inheritances can be justified. Property which comes by inheritance is an income received without toil. It is for the one receiving it an unearned increment of property, and on this account may properly be taxed. The most satisfactory basis upon which property can rest is personal toil and exertion of some kind, and when property comes otherwise than as a return for social service, a special tax finds a good solid basis in justice.

It generally happens, perhaps universally, that a large property does not pay its fair share of taxes during the lifetime of its owner, and the tax upon estates when their owners die may be regarded—if it is not too large—as a payment of back taxes. It is notorious with us that personal property bears relatively a very small proportion of the burdens of government, and it has been proposed that the ordinary property tax on personal property should be abolished, and that in the place thereof there should be substituted a tax on all estates of decedents in so far as they consist of personal property. These, however, are grounds only for a limited tax, which in the case of personal property ought to be added to the regular inheritance tax, if personal property is otherwise exempted from taxation.

The taxation of inheritances should be graduated, the tax increasing as the relationship becomes more distant, and as the property becomes larger. This is in the line of the present development of taxation of inheritances. The tax rises to 20 per cent. of the estate in some of the Swiss cantons, to 13 per cent.

in New Zealand, and to 10 or 11 per cent. in some other countries. I would have the tax vary from 1 to 20 per cent., establishing 20 per cent. as the maximum; at any rate, until public opinion is more enlightened. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is willing to see a tax-rate of even 50 per cent., and advocates such a high tax on estates of decedents on social grounds. It will probably be a long time before so high a tax would meet with general approval, but we know that a tax of 20 per cent. works well. In the case of near relatives, small amounts inherited by each ought to be entirely exempt from taxation. There is provision in the laws of many countries that small legacies left to servants should be free from taxation, and this, like other provisions recognizing the family, is praiseworthy.

The celebrated Professor Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, laid down these proposals for reform in the laws of inheritance :

First, the share of a child is not to be taxed unless it exceeds \$24,000, but of any excess above \$24,000 the local political unit (which, for the sake of brevity, we will hereafter call town in every case) shall receive 10 per cent. If the share of a child exceeds \$120,000, the state shall receive of the excess above \$120,000 a child's share.

Second, if the estate falls to parents or grandparents of the decedent, the town is to receive a share of 5 per cent. of the estate, provided the share of a single ancestor is more than \$2,400 but does not exceed \$12,000, and 10 per cent. of the excess of a share over \$12,000. If the share of a single ancestor exceeds \$24,000, the state receives a share equal to 10 per cent. of the surplus.

Third, the brothers and sisters, and children of brothers and sisters, of decedents are to be treated, so far as inheritance goes, like parents and grandparents.

Fourth, if the heirs of the decedent are descended from grandparents, but not from the same parents,—that is to say, if they are cousins, aunts, and uncles,—the town is to be entitled to a share of 10 per cent. of the estate if this exceeds \$2,400, and 20 per cent. of the excess of the estate above \$12,000. If the estate exceeds \$24,000, 20 per cent. of this excess is to go to the state, and not to the town.

Fifth, if the heirs of the decedent are descended from common great-grandparents, but not from common grandparents or

parents, the share of the town is to be 20 per cent. if the estate exceeds \$2,400, and 30 per cent. of the excess above \$12,000; and if the estate exceeds \$24,000, the state is to receive 30 per cent. of this excess.

Sixth, if the decedent has no relatives near enough to be descended from common great-grandparents, the estate is to fall to the town if it does not exceed in value \$12,000, but if the value is greater than this, the entire surplus above \$12,000 is to fall to the state.

Seventh, if the decedent leaves a husband or wife, the survivor is to have a life interest in the share of the town or state.

Bluntschli proposes that this property acquired by the local political units and the state should be used as a fund to support institutions especially designed to promote the interests of the property-less classes; also that it should be used to reward persons who have distinguished themselves in science or in art, or who have rendered especially valuable service to the poorer classes of society. He is unwilling to allow a diversion by will of that portion of an estate which falls to the town or state, but he is willing to allow a person to direct that that portion which belongs to the town or state as "duty part" (*Pflichttheil*) should be made over to charitable, benevolent, or educational foundations, provided town and state give their approval, and he is also willing that the testator should give survivors a life interest in that part of the estate which must ultimately fall to town or state.

These proposals of Bluntschli seem eminently wise and conservative, and, while it may be desirable to alter them in details, they furnish an excellent basis for discussion.

The use to be made of the funds acquired by the taxation of inheritances, and by establishing the co-heirship of town and state, must vary according to time and place. Bluntschli would have this property used to provide large estates for persons who have rendered signal service to the state. There is precedent enough for this in European states. Bismarck received a fortune after the Franco-Prussian War, and England has conferred fortunes upon great generals. While such a disposition of property to create great and powerful families may, perhaps, be proper enough in Germany, it would be altogether unsuitable for our country. There are, however, many uses which suggest themselves. In cases of cities, towns, and States weighed down with

debt, the payment of bonds would be an excellent employment of the funds. In case taxes are extraordinarily high and are weighing down industry, the tax-rate might be reduced. I think, however, that there are very few places in the United States where a properly-developed tax system would not provide for all present expenditures of government without overburdening any one. But there are great improvements which it is desirable to carry out, and these funds could be used to effect improvements which cost too much to be defrayed out of the ordinary taxation.

The States of the Union, and many of the towns, ought to go into forestry, purchasing large tracts of land, especially on mountains and along river courses, and covering these with trees. States and cities have allowed the ownership of valuable public works to slip away from them into the hands of private corporations. Water-works, gas works, street-car lines, and the like might be purchased and operated at cost. All great cities require a larger number of parks, especially of small parks in the crowded sections. Sanitary measures may be mentioned, and some of these are expensive. They, however, lower the death-rate and improve the health of the community. There are many cities which ought to buy slums and tear down the houses in them. The city of Manchester, England, bought quite a large tract of land in the centre of the city, which was the worst slum region in it, and tore down all the houses. It then leased the land for a limited term of years, to be built up with houses according to plans and specifications laid down. The result has been a remarkable improvement in Manchester, and it is said that, when these leases fall in, Manchester will be one of the richest, if not the richest, municipal corporation in the world. London has recently decided to undertake a similar improvement, but it is stated that in the case of London this will involve great expense.

School funds ought to be increased until they become great enough, with the aid of current taxation, to provide the entire population with the best educational facilities of every sort, including manual training, kindergartens, public libraries, universities, industrial museums, art-galleries, and the like. It would be especially desirable to improve the schools in the rural communities, establishing good high-schools wherever the population is sufficient to furnish them with pupils. Good schools in the country districts would tend to keep people in the country,

for now many leave the country and go to the cities purposely to educate their children. It is on every account desirable to make the country pleasanter and more attractive as a place of abode. Another fund may be suggested as suitable to be accumulated out of property inherited by the State and town, and that would be a highway fund, designed to help to improve the streets and roads of the State. The income of this fund could be distributed to towns and counties in such a manner as to encourage them in the improvement of roads and streets. It might be provided, for example, that for every two or three dollars expended by the local political unit one should be granted from the fund.

I believe the line of reform proposed in this article will stand every test which can be applied to it. It is, as already mentioned, a reform which meets with approval wherever tried, and with increasing approval the longer it is tried. It is a reform especially in keeping with democratic institutions, and it has succeeded best in democratic countries. So perfectly is it in keeping with true democracy that the purer, the more complete, and the more cultured the democratic countries have become in which this reform has been tried, the more they are inclined to move further along the same line. It is entirely compatible with the fundamental principles of the existing social order, and does not interfere with its normal and peaceful evolution. It antagonizes no other line of progress, but helps forward every other true reform. It provides ample public funds when accompanied by a rational system of taxation, and yet lays a burden heavy to be borne on no one.

We may examine this reform of the laws of inheritance with respect to the family, and we find that it tends to the development of the family as an institution far better than the existing laws in the United States. It recognizes the solidarity of the family. The husband is responsible to the wife and the wife to the husband, and both are responsible for the children they have brought into the world. It coördinates rights and duties. It may be stated, however, in this connection that duty should be extended among the various members of a family; in particular the reciprocal duties of parents and children should be sharpened and strengthened. The duty of support—and adequate support in proportion to means—should apply both to parents and to children, parents supporting the children in their youth, and children

the parents in their old age. The various members of the family organism should be drawn together by an extension of duties. It may be questioned whether any one should have the right to inherit from a person provided he may not under any circumstances be called upon to minister to his support. As Emerson and the other great thinkers have long been saying, it is time now to stop talking so much about rights, and to begin to emphasize duties.

If we look at this reform from the stand-point of society, we find that it stands every test to which it can be subjected. It diffuses property widely, and results in a great number of families with an ample competence, and tends to prevent the growth of plutocracy. It is these families with a competence lifting them above a severe struggle for bare physical necessities, which carry forward the world's civilization. It is from these families that the great leaders of men come, and not from either of the two extremes of society, the very rich or the very poor, both of which extremes we wish to abolish. Excessive wealth discourages exertion, but a suitable reform of the laws of inheritance will remove from us many idle persons who consume annually immense quantities of wealth, but contribute nothing to the support of the race; and who, leading idle lives, cultivate bad ideals and disseminate social poison. For the sake of the sons of the rich, as well as for the sake of the sons of the poor, we need a reform of the laws of inheritance.

A reform of the laws of inheritance of property will help us to approach that ideal condition in which the man who does not work shall not eat, and it will also tend to an equalization of opportunities so as to give all a fairer start in life, allowing each one to make such use of his opportunities as his capacity and diligence permit, and thus rendering inequalities, economic and social, less odious and injurious, more stimulating and helpful. This reform tends to make income a reward for service, thus realizing in a higher degree than at present the demands of justice. It must tend indirectly to discourage idleness and to encourage industry, and to repress that gambling, speculative spirit which desires something for nothing, and wants to get a living without rendering an honest return of some kind.

RICHARD T. ELY.

ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.

BY EDWARD A. FREEMAN, LL. D., D. C. L., REGIUS PROFESSOR
OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

THE English universities are, of all English institutions, those which foreigners find the greatest difficulty in understanding. And the difficulty is by no means confined to foreigners strictly so called. It extends to those who are nearest in blood to the people of England, and nearest in geographical position to the land itself. For the English universities are English in the narrowest local sense of that word. Their constitution, and much in them besides their constitution, is puzzling, not only to the stranger from the European continent, but to the Scottish and Irish subjects of the same crown and to the men of English blood and speech in the lands beyond the ocean. An English university is so different from a Continental, a Scottish, or an American university that those who are used only to the one find it hard to understand the nature of the other. Yet with some of the nations spoken of there is an easy way of piercing through the mystery. A visitor from Switzerland, from Canada, from the United States, ought soon to see his way through everything, if he is once put on the right tack.

The main peculiarity of the English university system, that which those who are not used to it find the main cause of puzzlement, is the existence of many colleges in one university. If I were to say that this is absolutely peculiar to Oxford and Cambridge, I might be met with the answer that more than one French and German university formerly contained several colleges, and that there still are two or more colleges in the Scottish University of Saint Andrew's. But if the Continental instances were really at all like Oxford and Cambridge, they exist no longer to be compared with them, and the colleges at Saint Andrew's differ altogether from the colleges in the English universities.

Practically Oxford and Cambridge stand by themselves; they are institutions singularly like one another in their main outlines, and, at the same time, utterly unlike anything else in the whole world. Each is an university containing many colleges. On the European continent we hear, as a rule, only of universities, not of colleges. In France the word *collège* is often heard, but it means what we should call a school. In America "college" and "university" mean the same kind of institution; only "university" is thought to be the more dignified name. And what either "college" or "university" means is, allowing for difference of circumstances, what an English university would be if colleges had never been founded in it, or if all its colleges should be suppressed. How puzzling the English system is to all who are not used to it is revealed to those who are by not a few signs. I constantly receive foreign—sometimes English—letters addressed to "the university." I have been asked in Europe whether I lived "in the university." The university is supposed to be, as it commonly is in Germany and Italy, a single institution, having its home in a single large building. But the oddest confusion of all was that of an American professor who, in his book of travels in England, ended a fairly accurate description of the several colleges at Cambridge with this remark: "The formal style of Cambridge College is 'The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.'"

But with either an American or a Swiss visitor, with any visitor, in short, who comes from a country with a federal constitution, the way to give him a clearer notion of things is not hard. Tell him that in an English university the university answers to the Union and the colleges to the States, and he at once begins to understand. Tell him that there are certain things which each college can do for itself, and certain other things which only the whole university can do. Tell him that each college, like each State, manages its own affairs and its own property, that each exercises its own discipline over its own members, but that the university, like the Union, has its own range and its own discipline also. Tell him that a single college can no more grant a degree than a single State can coin money or declare war. Let him well take in all this, and he will, in King Harry's phrase, have got the sow by the right ear. Only a warning will be necessary. He must be further told that this

illustration, though practically as near as any illustration is likely to be, is historically false. That is to say, the practical, every-day relation of the university and the colleges is very like that of the Union and the States ; but no one must think that, as the Union is an aggregate of States, so the university is an aggregate of colleges. The university was in being before the colleges, and it would go on, untouched in any material respect, though every college in it were suppressed. The colleges in all things presuppose the university ; they have no object or meaning apart from the university. The university grew up for the promotion of learning ; the colleges were founded in order that certain persons might receive the advantages of the university and its teachings who otherwise might not have attained to them.

The university grew up ; the colleges were founded. That is a point very necessary to notice. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge may, with the most literal truth, say, like Topsy : "Nobody made me ; 'spects I growed." And in truth it is a matter of suspicion. We suspect that the first small beginnings of the growth of the University of Oxford happened in the reign of Henry the First ; but we do not do much more than suspect. We have no certain records. We had a certain Robert Puleyn lecturing in divinity, and a little later we find a more famous Vacarius lecturing in civil law. We naturally suspect that we have here the beginning of two of the great faculties of the university. Before the end of the twelfth century these germs, or some others, had certainly "grewed" into a large body of masters and scholars. And in the course of the twelfth century bountiful men began to found colleges in those universities which had thus come into being of themselves. But no man, king or bishop or private person, founded either of the universities. Still less did anybody endow them. Masters began to teach ; scholars came to hear ; and the thing grew up. The whole body of such masters and scholars, like the whole body of any other class of people, was called its "universitas." In the noble Latin rimes of the thirteenth century, which so well set forth the whole doctrine of popular government, we read :

"Igitur communitas regni consulatur,
Et quid universitas sentiat sciatur."

Here the "universitas" means the same as the "communitas"—that is, it means nothing short of the whole people of England.

Thus the "university"—that is, simply the whole body—of the masters and scholars of Oxford or Cambridge gradually grew up. We have popular errors to strive against at every step, and the one that has to be striven against just now is the very common belief that the towns of Oxford and Cambridge are something secondary to the universities, and grew up around them. No one is likely to make this mistake about either a German or an American university; but in England it is really very common. How common it is is shown in both houses of Parliament whenever there is any debate about university matters. People see that the town is—or at least was—something quite subordinate to the university, and they fancy that it is something newer than the university, something that grew up because the university was there. They think, if they think at all, that Oxford and Cambridge are like those towns which grew up round some castle or great church, commonly some great abbey. Of such there are many in England, though but few among the greater towns. But the city of Oxford and borough of Cambridge had been in being long before the universities began. Both figure in the wars of the tenth and eleventh centuries, while true history cannot place the feeblest beginning of the universities before the twelfth. Oxford, above all, was one of the most important posts in England. As long as any trace or memory lasted of the old independence of Mercia and Wessex, Oxford, the chief town on the upper course of the boundary stream of Thames, was one of the greatest military and political centres in England. Before the Norman conquest, and long after, Oxford was the chosen place for great national gatherings. And Cambridge, though not of the same historical importance as Oxford, was a strong military post, and a considerable town according to the standard of the time.

The universities, then, arose by masters and scholars settling in existing towns. They did not, as monks sometimes did, sit down under a green tree, and see a town grow round them. The universities grew till they became independent of the towns, and even superior to the towns; but the town and its jurisdiction were the older. And Oxford and Cambridge were towns which were well suited for the growth of such independence on the part of the universities. Oxford, a great place for holding national councils, an occasional dwelling-place of kings, was not, like many other towns, under

the immediate power or influence of any great lord, temporal or spiritual. One great object with the rising university was to be independent of the diocesan bishop, and Oxford was in the vast diocese of Lincoln, whose bishop was far away. At Cambridge the Bishop of Ely was much nearer ; still the masters and scholars were not actually at his gate.

The universities gradually obtained privileges from kings and popes which made them independent of all ordinary jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal. They became great and powerful bodies ; but they never became wealthy bodies. It is a common notion that the English universities are very rich. In truth, the universities, as corporations, have, to this day, very little property. They hold a good deal in trust for various purposes in the universities. They draw an income from various payments made by their members, chiefly at taking degrees, and also from the profits of the university press. But of actual property of its own the university itself, the corporation of the chancellor, masters, and scholars, holds very little. Nor had the universities for many ages any great public buildings. At Oxford the university held its meetings in Saint Mary's Church and buildings attached to it. There is no important university building in Oxford older than the latter part of the fifteenth century.

The element of property and of the influence which follows property, and the element of buildings also, came in with the colleges. The word *college*, in its original meaning, has nothing to do with learning or education. It simply means a company of men of any kind, associated for some common purpose and usually holding common property. In the universities a college means a foundation for the maintenance of masters or scholars in the university, living together according to such rules as its founder lays down. They have a house to live in, and property, land, or tithe to live on. The first masters and scholars in the universities lived where they could and how they could ; they had no houses and no endowments. Gradually the scholars began to live together in small societies, in houses called halls, which at first might be the property of anybody. A hall might belong to a citizen who let his house for scholars to live in, or it might belong to a monastery which kept it for the use of its own members who went to study in the university. Gradually the halls were brought under some kind

of university discipline, as lodging-houses are now. Scholars lived in a hall, with a master as its principal. But at Oxford the halls never became corporate bodies holding property. Anything given for their benefit was held for them in trust by the university. At Cambridge the case is seemingly different, but only seemingly. That is to say, when endowed societies began to be founded, some of those at Cambridge were called *halls* and some *colleges*. The name does not matter. If by a hall be understood a house occupied by students, a college is simply an endowed and incorporated hall. Only at Oxford some of the older unendowed halls lived on alongside of the endowed colleges, while at Cambridge *hall* and *college* mean the same thing.

The system of colleges began in the reign of Henry the Third, in the year 1274, when Walter of Merton, Bishop of Rochester, removed to Oxford a body of scholars which he had already begun to found at Merton, in Surrey. His example was followed in 1280 by Hugh of Balsham, Bishop of Ely, who founded Saint Peter's College, commonly called Peterhouse, in Cambridge. This oldest college at Cambridge grew, like many others, out of the system of halls. The founder had already given two halls for the reception of scholars. He afterwards gave them the full form and endowment of a college. These two, Merton and Peterhouse, are the oldest foundations at Oxford and Cambridge respectively. Two others at Oxford, University and Balliol, claim an older date, but untruly. They arose out of benefactions older than that of Walter of Merton, but not benefactions which took the shape of a college. They did not take the form of colleges till long after. It is a puzzling thing to strangers that one of the colleges in the University of Oxford should be specially called University College. Are they not all university colleges? So in a sense they are. But University College had something specially to do with the university. Its proper name was the Great Hall of the University. That is, it grew out of a hall which was the property of the university itself. That it, or anything else at Oxford, unless possibly military works, was founded by Alfred, King of the West Saxons, in the ninth century, is pure fiction.

From the thirteenth century, then, till the nineteenth, colleges—endowed foundations for the residence and maintenance of students—have been at various times founded in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In several cases, as at Peterhouse,

as in the last foundation of a college, that of Hertford at Oxford only a few years back, the college grew out of an older hall. That is, the hall supplied the site and buildings for the new foundation. A college is not in itself a place of education. It is a house for men to dwell in who come to profit by the education and other advantages given by the university. Subject to any later changes made by the law of the land, each college holds such property as its founder gave it ; it is governed by such statutes as its founder made for it ; it is under such visitation as the founder decreed for it, the King, a bishop, the heir or representative of the founder, or any other. With the property of any college, with its internal management, the university has nothing to do ; each college is subject to later benefactions and to changes made by the authority of the state, whatever its founder chose to make it. The founder made his endowment for such fellows or scholars as he thought good, under a head with whatever title he thought good. Some colleges have been enlarged by later benefactions ; some have not. Their connection with the university consisted mainly in this : the founder required the members of his college to be students in the university, and to take such and such degrees, and the only way of getting those degrees was by going through such examinations or other exercises as the university required.

The constitutions of the colleges follow one general pattern, but most colleges have some peculiarities of their own. That some foundations are richer than others, that some consist of more members than others, is only the common course of human affairs. But there are all manner of differences between college and college. Some foundations had only one class of members, called indifferently fellows and scholars. In others the fellows are an older, the scholars a younger, class. In some the choice of the fellows and scholars was perfectly open ; in others they had to be chosen from particular schools or counties. In some the scholars had a claim to the fellowships or a preference for them ; in others not. In some the fellows were bound sooner or later to take holy orders ; in others some or all might remain laymen. In some it was necessary or advantageous to take the higher degrees in divinity, law, or medicine ; in others degrees in arts were enough. But all colleges agreed in one point. As the very essence of a college was that it should be a body of students living together

in common, the fellows and scholars were necessarily unmarried. This had nothing to do with the celibacy of the clergy ; it was implied in the very nature of a college, and applied to lay and clerical fellows equally. Above all, no one must fancy that the colleges in the universities are, or ever were, as they are sometimes foolishly called, "monastic" bodies. Save in one or two cases, where a hall belonging to a monastery had grown into a college, there was nothing monastic about them. From the foundation of Merton onwards, any man who "entered religion," that is, who took the monastic vows, at once lost his place in the college.

A college, then, was, in its beginnings, simply an endowed house for the residence and maintenance of students in the university. Its members had no kind of formal advantage over other members of the university who did not belong to any college. But it was gradually found that the life of a college had many practical advantages. It offered many attractions even to those who were not members of the foundation. Most colleges, therefore, besides their own fellows and scholars, took in other members of the university, who lived in college at their own cost. Gradually the practice of living in colleges became all but universal; the only exception was that some still lived in the few halls which survived. At last in the seventeenth century, by the statutes of Archbishop Laud, every member of the University of Oxford was bound to be a member of some college or hall. This rule has been abolished in our own times, and it is now again possible to be a member of the university without belonging to any college. As for the halls, they seem to be dying out. Ali, save one or two, have been either merged into some college or have themselves grown into colleges. On the other hand, the new body called Keble College, having no foundation, is not a real college, but only a very large hall.

The constitution of the university, in its original state, had, of course, nothing to do with the colleges. Looking at the university as a corporation, its constitution is highly democratic. Every qualified citizen of the commonwealth—that is, every member who has taken a complete degree in any faculty, and who keeps his name on the books and makes the needful payments—has a vote in the general assembly of the university. This is called convocation at Oxford and senate at Cambridge. The head

of the university is the chancellor, freely elected by the senate or convocation. The chancellor and convocation have power to make statutes, to make decrees for particular cases, and to confer degrees. But the conferring of ordinary degrees belongs at Oxford to a smaller body, the congregation, now known as the ancient house, to distinguish it from a later body of the same name. But this old democratic constitution has been in many ways modified, and also in some respects restored, in quite modern times. In the original constitution of the university college distinctions naturally went for nothing. The head of a college was, in the university, simply whatever his degree made him, master of arts or doctor of one of the higher faculties. He had no rights or place whatever beyond any other doctor or master. But the position was an influential one in itself, and one which could not fail to grow in importance as the colleges grew, and gradually came to take in all the members of the university.

The chancellor was at first a resident member of the university, standing to the whole university much as the head of each college did to his own college. But as the university grew in importance, its headship grew in dignity, if not in importance. Great men who were not resident, noblemen or ministers of state, were chosen chancellors. The active duties of the office fell to a vice-chancellor, and the vice-chancellor came, not unnaturally, to be appointed from among the heads of colleges. At last, by Archbishop Laud's statutes, the general discipline of the university, and specially the proposal of statutes and other measures to convocation, was placed in a body consisting of the vice-chancellor, the heads of colleges and halls, and the proctors. These last are the chief ministers of discipline in the university. They are chosen yearly. Anciently they were chosen by the whole body of convocation. By one of Laud's statutes the choice was transferred to the colleges in turn according to a certain cycle. Strictly, the choice was not in the college as such, but in those members of convocation who belonged to the college. Still in all these ways the colleges encroached on the university and undermined its constitution. To go back to our federal analogy, the state of things came to be somewhat as if the chief power of the Union were vested in a meeting of the governors of the several States. At Cambridge the heads of colleges got in some things more power than at Oxford; in others less. At Oxford all elections by convocation re-

mained free. At Cambridge the heads of colleges came at all elections by the senate to nominate two candidates, and the senate could choose only one of those two. On the other hand, the power of proposing measures to the senate was in another body representing the several faculties.

In all this we have said nothing about professors, tutors, or teachers of any kind. In the old theory of the university, every man who had taken a complete degree in any faculty was supposed to be able and willing to act as a teacher in that faculty. The words *doctor*, *master*, *professor*, all meant the same thing—one who had taken a complete degree of some kind. To this day every doctor in divinity is called, in Latin, “*sacrae theologiae professor*.” This use of words has given rise to some confusion. One has seen it said over and over again that John Wickliffe was “professor of divinity” at Oxford, meaning that he was the holder of a special and endowed office, like a professor now. But in Wickliffe’s day there were no special and endowed professors of particular subjects. Wickliffe was professor only as every doctor in divinity was professor. But in his day the doctor’s degree itself was still reckoned a great honor. The notion of every doctor and master being a teacher has died out in several ways. It has died out before the growth of endowed professors in the university and of tutors and lecturers in the several colleges. And it has died out still more by the lowering of the standard of degrees in all the faculties.

Till quite lately the degrees in the superior faculties had become quite nominal; they proved nothing. Now degrees in law and medicine have again come to have a meaning; but the degree in divinity is still little more than a form. So in arts the standard for the bachelor’s degree is very low, and that for the master’s degree is no higher. There is, to be sure, an elaborate system of class lists, in which various shades of honor are bestowed on the candidates for the bachelor’s degree. But it is the class which is valued; the degree itself is a small matter. The supposed necessity of marking by special honors those whose work is really creditable, the further development of having wholly distinct examinations for those who seek for honors and for those who do not, show how low the mere degree has fallen. And, besides this, the master’s degree is given, as a matter of course, to every bachelor of the required standing, without further examina-

tion or other exercise. This, at least, is not as it should be. In any university the degree alone should be worth something ; it should be worth a good deal. The lower degree should mark something, and the higher degree should mark more. The bachelor's degree should be respectable, and the master's degree should be honorable.

To explain the exact position of an Oxford professor and an Oxford tutor to one who is not familiar with the system is even harder than to explain the relations between the university and the colleges. The professor, as I have just said, is an endowed university teacher. In an university which has no colleges the professors will naturally be the immediate teachers of the undergraduates. In an university which has colleges that work will more naturally fall to the college tutors. In such a case the professor is, or ought to be, a master of his own subject, the representative of that subject in the university, ready to lecture and teach in every shape within the higher ranges of that subject. He is not called upon to give the ordinary teaching needed for the degree. Of course no teaching ought to have the degree as its immediate object ; all such teaching is to be eschewed as *cram*.

But there is clearly room for two classes of teachers—those who give the ordinary teaching in subjects required for the degree, and those who teach either subjects which are not required for the degree or the higher branches of those that are. The latter is the work of the professor—the master of his own subject, whatever that subject is. The former is the work of somebody else, most obviously of the college tutor. The tutor, as well as the professor, is a development, a very natural development, of the ancient doctor or master, qualified to teach as doctor or master. He is in his origin an university officer no less than the professor, and in his origin he had not necessarily anything to do with teaching.

The word *tutor* means, as Scottish lawyers, at all events, know, not a teacher, but a guardian. Every undergraduate was put under the care of a master as his tutor ; and, as the college grew up, the tutor was naturally a member, commonly a fellow, of his own college. Gradually the chief work of teaching came to the tutors in the colleges. Nor is there the slightest objection to this, if proper relations existed between tutors and professors. Each has his separate work, and the two could very well work in

harmony. Perhaps there has been no time when both did work in harmony; perhaps there has been no time when both have worked at all. But in a healthy state of things, the tutor would take the lower and the professor the higher branches of university teaching. The tutor would be the immediate teacher of the men of his own college, to whom he stands in a personal relation. The professor would be a representative of the special branch of learning in the university generally, standing in no personal relation to any one, having nothing to do with examinations, but standing ready to give the higher instruction to any that need it—pupils, tutors, examiners, or any other. The ideal has perhaps never been carried out; it is certainly not carried out now. But it does seem to be one which it would not be impossible to carry out. It certainly seems to be that which is naturally suggested by the coexistence of the university and its several colleges. It might even be thought that it was one of the advantages of the coexistence of the university and the colleges that such a division of the work of teaching is possible.

The causes which have hindered the carrying-out of such an ideal state of things are many and of many kinds. Some are old; some are new. Some it might be easy to get rid of; with some the work of improvement would be harder. But this sketch of the way in which the English university grew up in its main features may possibly be of some interest to those who are better used to other systems. It may even have interest enough to make some wish to hear a little more of the changes made during the present century, and of the practical working of things at the present moment.

EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

INDUSTRIAL AND FINANCIAL COÖPERATION.

BY FRANCIS B. THURBER.

THE increasing tendency of the larger business houses to incorporate is noticeable, and it is interesting to examine the whys and wherefores of it, and also take a glance at the entire coöperative field.

The underlying causes to which the increased activities of coöperation are chiefly attributable, are, undoubtedly, steam, electricity, and machinery, which constitute the controlling forces in the industrial, commercial, and, indeed, the entire politico-economic world. These forces have so increased the activities of competition, both in manufacturing and distribution, that they have greatly fostered the transaction of business on a large scale, which could command the best talent and the greatest economies.

This is manifested in so many different forms that it is difficult to do more than allude to some of the principal types of coöperative effort; and these, perhaps, naturally divide into coöperative production and coöperative distribution. It is in the latter that the greatest strides seem to have been made, although the coöperative principle is being recognized increasingly in both branches.

It is now many years since the manufacture of butter and cheese by the factory or coöperative system became a success, and through this the average quality of our butter and cheese supply has been greatly improved, with the result also that prices, on the whole, are considerably higher; a tendency, by the way, which is in striking contrast with the effect on most other articles that are produced coöperatively.

Various persons have claimed the credit of introducing the "factory" system of cheese-making, but while many have helped, probably no one person is entitled to the entire credit. It was perfectly evident that some farms possessed better facilities than others for making cheese. Some localities had better water;

some possessed more skilful cheese-makers ; some had better appliances than others ; and it was a natural evolution of the business that it should occur to some one that if the milk or cream was brought to a central station where the best facilities existed, and where it could be manipulated by an expert, a better result would be obtained than where a dozen or twenty different farmers operated under as many different conditions and with varying degrees of skill.

So the manufacture of cheese under the factory system became at once a success, and suggested the coöperative system in making butter, which is popularly known as the "creamery" system ; all the farmers within a given area bringing their cream to a central station, where it is made into butter, with a much better average result than would be obtainable by individual effort.

The same principle is now worked out in the manufacture of sugar, the cane being conveyed to central sugar-houses, and in many different mining and manufacturing companies, where, to prosecute the business economically, more capital than is at the command of the average individual operator is required. Hence companies have been formed in which capital is worked coöperatively, producing far better results than could otherwise be obtained. Any number of stockholders can thus be combined as partners in an establishment large enough to command the best talent and the best facilities.

The stocks of the great manufacturing establishments, both in England and the United States, are, in many cases, widely distributed ; and where this did not take place in the beginning, as the business increased and the vitality of the individual owners decreased, in many cases they were reorganized upon a coöperative basis.

The uncertainties of life, and the difficulty of valuing and distributing estates after death, especially where a business was conducted by a partnership, are, of themselves, a strong reason for organizing upon a stock-company basis, and of late years there have been many cases, both in productive and distributive coöperation, where this was a controlling consideration.

DISTRIBUTIVE COÖPERATION.

Probably the first prominent instances of distributive coöperation were found in transportation lines. Even before the advent

of steam, individual shipowners combined their interests in lines of packet-ships, whose regularity of sailing, combined with the best-known improvements in the handling of merchandise and the quality of service rendered, gave them an advantage over irregular ships, which in this day and generation are now generally known in trade parlance as "tramps"—a graphic bit of trade slang, by the way, which well illustrates the tendency of business to organize more closely.

With the advent of railroads on land, coöperation in their construction and operation became a necessity; and, as an agency in the distribution of products, banks also furnish a prominent illustration of the economies and effectiveness of coöperative effort.

Distributive coöperation has been, perhaps, brought before the public most prominently through the success of the so-called coöperative stores in England, but such stores, strange to say, in this country have not been a success, although other forms of coöperation here have succeeded admirably. The reason, however, is probably found in the different conditions. In England the retail trade had grown into a system of long credits. Many landed proprietors and others received their income only at long intervals, and this led retail merchants into the habit of selling a large portion of their trade on long time, which inevitably resulted in considerable losses from bad debts; so the dealers had to raise their margins of profit upon all their customers to a point which would still leave them a living. This was virtually making the cash-paying customer support the customer who did not pay at all; and when this abuse became extended, the persons with fixed incomes who paid their debts naturally objected, and the result was the formation of societies for coöperative distribution on an economical cash basis.

One of the first of these societies was started at Rochdale, a manufacturing centre, and its success stimulated the establishment of similar societies in other places, until finally a wholesale coöperative society was established at Manchester for the supply of constituent retail societies. The employees of the civil service, and the army and navy, representing considerable classes by themselves, established large supply stores, which deal in almost everything required in the household, and have been very successful. The success, however, of the first-comers in the distributive

coöperative field induced many others to make similar attempts, which were not equally successful. The grocers soon learned that in order to compete with the coöperative establishments they must adopt the cash system, and give as good or better value and service, and this has been done to a great extent. It is safe to say that the coöperative movement in England grew out of a necessity, and has remedied an abuse. The same state of things did not exist in the United States. Retail merchants generally sold on closer margins of profit; many of them did business for cash; and hence the same conditions and necessities did not exist here that gave rise to the coöperative stores in England. Many attempts have been made, but only a few of them have succeeded, and those only to a moderate extent. In such cases success was probably due to exceptionally good management, and perhaps, to some extent, to other local conditions favoring coöperative distribution. It is probable also that the opportunities in this country for enterprising men to develop had something to do with the difficulties experienced here in obtaining competent and honest managers for reasonable compensation. Men reasoned that, if they could make money for a coöperative association, they could make as much, or more, for themselves, and did not feel called upon to sacrifice their own interests to the coöperative idea.

A phase of the coöperative principle which has attracted much attention during the last few years has been the reorganization of firms into corporations, and the virtual admission of the public to partnership in the various establishments. This has become of great interest to investors, and has attracted a great deal of capital from savings-institutions and from other investors paying but a small rate of interest.

In some lines of business there seems to be almost an epidemic of such reorganizations, especially in England. Take, for instance, the brewing business in both England and the United States. Beginning with the Guinness breweries in Dublin a few years ago, there have been absorbed a large number of the most prominent breweries in England, Ireland, and this country; and more recently the idea has extended to other lines, prominent among which are the London concerns of Foster & Porter, and the Fore Street Warehousing Company, wholesale dry-goods establishments, and John Howell & Co., jewellers; and very recently it has been announced that Messrs. Maple & Co., the great furnishing-

house of London, has been turned into a corporation with a capital of £2,000,000, or \$10,000,000.

In this country the establishment of Tiffany & Co., of New York, was probably the first prominent example of a commercial house becoming a corporation, and its greatest successes have been achieved since its change of form. Last year the great dry-goods house of H. B. Claflin & Co. became the H. B. Claflin Company, and within a few months Thurber, Whyland & Co., probably the oldest and largest wholesale grocery house in the world, became the Thurber, Whyland Company.

In all these cases the capital stocks were very widely distributed, a feature being large subscriptions by employees; and a feature of some of the later incorporations, notably that of the Trow Directory, Printing, and Bookbinding Company, is that the employees are represented in the board of directors by one of their number. This class of stocks is, as a rule, sought for by small investors who wish to make more than the rate of interest allowed by savings-banks and trust companies. They are non-speculative in character, and such investments are likely to become favorites with the smaller class of *bond-fide* investors.

Another class of coöperative investments, somewhat more speculative in character, is found in the combinations in various industries, such as the Standard Oil Company, or Trust, with a capital, or "certificates," of \$90,000,000; the American Sugar-Refining Company, commonly known as the "Sugar Trust," which has combined the principal sugar refineries of the country, with a capitalization of \$50,000,000; the National Cordage Company, which embraces the principal rope, cordage, and twine manufacturers of the country, with a capital of \$15,000,000; the American Cotton-Oil Company, with a capital of \$32,000,000, which undertakes to own and control the principal mills for making cotton-seed oil; the Distillers and Cattle-Feeders' Company, with a capital of \$31,500,000, which owns nearly all the distilleries of the country manufacturing alcohol and spirits; the Lead Trust Company, which owns and controls the principal white-lead manufactories of the country, with a nominal capital of \$90,000,000; the Linseed-Oil Trust, capital \$18,000,000; the American Tobacco Company, capital \$10,000,000, which has practically consolidated the cigarette and smoking-tobacco manufactories of the country; the National Starch Company,

capital \$9,500,000 ; and there are a number of other organizations formed for the purpose of controlling some particular industry, limiting production to the wants of the market, and maintaining prices which will be remunerative to the manufacturers.

In these objects they have been only partially successful ; and it may be said that only in cases where prices have been kept down to a reasonable profit, so that new capital is not tempted into these industries, are they likely to be successful. Their shares are dealt in on the Stock Exchange, and some of them are extremely speculative in character, exhibiting violent fluctuations as they are worked up and down by the "insiders." Unless this speculative element is eliminated, it will probably injure the reputation of industrial stocks generally as legitimate investments. Indeed, it has already been proposed to call the securities of the individual corporations "commercial investment stocks," in order to distinguish them from the more speculative "industrials," which usually represent amalgamations of different establishments.

Even the speculative industrials, however, are likely, in the long run, to pay investors dividends much larger than investments in railroad securities ; and the only wonder is, when one contemplates the vast number of railroad reorganizations, with the wiping-out or scaling-down of investments through competitive building, and the cutting of rates by speculative directors and managers, to say nothing of Granger legislation and Interstate Commerce-Law complications, that investors do not stop buying railroad securities altogether and invest in industrial or commercial investment stocks.

The following from the *New York Daily Commercial Bulletin* of January 7, 1891, strikingly illustrates how investors in railroad securities have been swindled :

"The *Chicago Railway Age* publishes a compilation showing the foreclosure sales and receiverships of railroads in the United States during 1890, which strikingly reflects the depressed condition of that interest. Within the past year twenty-nine companies were subjected to foreclosure sale, with a funded debt of \$90,851,000 and a capital stock of \$91,654,000. Discouraging as this showing may appear, yet it is a fact still more discouraging that the foreclosures of the last fifteen years show even a higher annual average than those of 1890. Since 1875 the aggregate foreclosure sales cover 50,525 miles, with \$2,865,000,000 of combined stock and bonds, or an average of \$191,000,000 per annum. Of this huge total, \$980,000,000 occurred during the three years 1885, 1886, and 1887 ; and yet so little was the moral effect of

those disastrous years that, immediately following, a furore of speculative construction set in which resulted in the severe financial crisis from which we are now emerging. The foregoing significant figures, however, tell only part of the story; for, within the past year 2,963 miles of road have been placed under receiverships with a combined total of capital stock and bonds amounting to \$105,007,000. When may we expect investors to learn better than to put their capital into railroad schemes started on a wholly speculative basis?"

Industrial investments may have their good and their bad years, but they certainly cannot fail to make a better record by far than the foregoing, or, indeed, the government loans in which English and other foreign investors have so freely invested their savings at low rates of interest.

BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS.

Another form of coöperative investment which has grown very rapidly during the past few years is the building and loan associations, which are nothing more or less than coöperative savings-banks, and constitute a form of life insurance which has been as successful as it has been beneficent. But few people are aware of the extent to which the coöperative principle has been applied in this direction. A recent article in *Bradstreet's* says:

"The aggregate resources of the savings associations of the country are nearly 60 per cent. of the entire assets of all State, savings, loan and trust companies and private banks and bankers from which reports were received last year. Their deposits were less than 10 per cent. below those of the national banks, and were more than twice as large as the total capital stock of the national banks. With this true now, when ordinary savings-banks are practically confined to a small part of the country, what will happen when the new form of savings-bank gets its growth throughout the Union?"

The chief development of the building and loan associations has been in the Western States, although they have also a strong hold in the Middle States. The last report of the Comptroller of the Currency showed that, of the 637 strictly old-style mutual savings-banks in the country, all but 11 are in the New England and Middle States with Maryland and the District of Columbia.

The building and loan association, or coöperative savings-bank, has many features which give it superiority over the ordinary savings-bank. It is conducted by people who give it their time for nothing, as the association meets generally but once a month in some room or hall where the expense is but small for rent and fittings. Deposits are paid at stated periods and the depositors themselves really control and manage the association.

The only drawback has been that these really beneficent coöperative institutions have been somewhat interfered with by speculative organizations similar in name and calling themselves national building and loan associations and various other high-sounding titles. These are gotten up by schemers who seek to ride into the possession or control of capital on the front wave of popularity of the local building and loan associations. Various States are now enacting legislation which will bring all forms of coöperative savings-banks or associations under State supervision, and it is expected that this will tend to prevent or restrict the abuses of the so-called national building and loan associations before alluded to.

Other features of the building and loan association, or the coöperative savings-bank, are, that it lends only to depositors, that it lends to the highest bidder (provided the security is good), and secures by the share system repayment on the instalment plan. It has become a popular means for workingmen to procure homes ; and this, together with the industrial establishments taking the form of corporations in which employees and the public can become shareholders and virtually partners, is destined in the near future to play an important part in advancing the prosperity of the masses. It is a development of the coöperative idea which is in perfect accord with the spirit of our country's institutions ; and although we may never reach Mr. Bellamy's politico-economic millennium, coöperation in its various phases will do much to that end.

F. B. THURBER.

THE RELATIONS OF LITERATURE TO SOCIETY.

BY MRS. AMELIA E. BARR.

MOST social truths are truths for circumstances, and for periods; they are very seldom truths absolute and eternal. Among such passing verities, Carlyle's dictum concerning what book-writers do for the world and the small esteem the world has for book-writers must be classed. That literature has not yet found its harmonious relation to society is true; but it is not true that any large or important portion of society acts toward literature as depicted in a late society novel—that is, it does not hide the fact of a woman writing a book, as if she had committed some unpardonable social crime. A minority, at whose pretensions the world takes leave to laugh with a good-natured tolerance, may indeed regard writers with scorn, but the writers feel for this minority a contempt so measureless as to leave a good standing balance in their own favor.

So far, then, the two classes are quits; yet it may not be amiss to give a moment's consideration to the assertion of this Brahminical Four Hundred that writing is "low," and that it is especially "low" for a woman. These definitions are understood when explained by the rules governing a set so exclusive. Writers have ideals; writers are original in speech, in dress, and manners. Now, among a class where the commonplace and the conservative are invincible rules of conduct, where etiquette has a bible of its own, and the laws of dining, dressing, speech, company, and even feeling, are decorously and definitely laid down, could there be anything more impertinent than an ideal, more vulgar than originality? And as a woman sinning against the social code is a sinner above all others, it is perhaps a justifiable kindness to prevent her from making a book. Such a declaration of individuality might open the door for her rebellion against social slavery of all kinds.

But the number of this social set is very small, and their influence upon the great world of thought and action almost *nil*. Nothing is lost to literature by their neglect, and nothing would

be gained by their condescending to use literature as an expounder of their articles of faith and admiration. Writers of all sorts may easily let this portion of society be to them as if they were not.

However, it might, with some show of truth, be asserted that literature has not a high social standing, even among that large class of sensible citizens whose mental capacities have been well developed, and whose refinement is as evident as their wealth—men and women who live noble lives, in constant contact with the great facts of life, just and generous, free from arrogance, ardently appreciative of every good book. And, as in all good books there is an invisible element, a subtle principle emanating from the writer to the reader, it does seem singular that the book which is part of the writer—his soul impressed on the white paper—should be highly valued, and he himself awaken no living interest; nay, perhaps meet only with indifference or dislike.

We may find a partial answer to this singular condition by applying to literature that commercial test so well understood in all other matters. Men and women write books either because they have something to say or because they are under the necessity of saying something. In the first case, literature is followed for literature's sake, and society feels that it is under an obligation for the effort to please or instruct it. In the second case, the book has been written as a means of livelihood; the writer has the financial result, and society is under no more obligation to him or to her than it is to the clergyman who preaches to it for money, or the lawyer who defends it for money, or the physician who heals it for money. A fine rider, a clever ball-player, a tireless walker, are all objects of social admiration and respect, until they turn these accomplishments into a means of livelihood; then the athlete, the pitcher, the rider, the dancer, find that in accepting a financial reward they have forfeited their social recognition; perhaps not unfairly so, for few things are worth paying twice for, and they who desire the cash must do without the praise and admiration.

This position is easily comprehensible under old monarchical dispensations, but certainly anomalous in a country where money is the test of all efforts, and the making of money the most honorable of occupations. Indeed, we must go back to the very beginnings of social life to discover its origin, and acknowledge that for sixty centuries the world has held the men of action

higher than the men of thought. The soldier Cæsar received from it the imperial crown; the thinker Christ, the shameful cross. Romulus the fighter is remembered; Remus the seer is forgotten. At the end of the nineteenth century we are still barbarians enough to think a successful soldier higher than an almost godlike inventor. For this world is a material world, and it ranks men as they meet its necessities. The fighter and the money-maker touch constantly its most active and imperious demands; the writer and the thinker only serve its higher and most transitory moods. If, then, writers and thinkers are not satisfied with the amount of social consideration they receive, they have only to desist from instructing and entertaining mankind, and do something for a livelihood which touches what men eat or drink, or the wherewith of their dress or adornment.

These are radical and ancient causes of slight esteem, but there are others which are generic, and which spring from the profession. First, there is a singular lack of *esprit de corps* in the higher walks of it: even successful writers have not scrupled to make its peculiarities and poverty "material" for their wit; as in "Pendennis," where Thackeray introduces his readers to writers, publishers, editors, and contributors who are neither attractive nor respectable, and who are rather abnormal than typical.

But it is the easy entrance into the ranks of literature which is the great cause of whatever social contempt clings to the profession. A man who goes into a large trading business, or who spends years in preparing for the law, gives society a bond for his respectability. He has invested either time or money, perhaps both. But a pretence of literature is too often used by the lazy and vicious as a cloak for their evil lives, and thus the noblest of professions becomes a kind of cave of Adullam, to which men of unsteady habits and women of doubtful respectability resort. A sprightly fancy, a ready wit, a knowledge of life, a soured disposition able and unscrupulous enough to write scurrilous personalities, are all the introduction needed to the daily press, where the demand is constant, and the availability depends more on the mental than the moral qualities of its servants. For if a man writes a brilliant paper, do the public really care whether he is a member of a Christian association or not?

But this class of writers are in no true sense "men of letters." They produce paragraphs, epigrams, short, clever sketches, short

stories, poems for the newspapers and other periodicals; but works demanding learning, patience, steady application, are as much beyond their power as they are out of their liking. Such ephemeral literary workers can no more be classed with writers like Mr. Grote, Mr. Holmes, or Mr. Stevenson than the pettifogger can be counted the peer of the judge in the Supreme Court, or the pedler of quack nostrums the equal of the leading physician of the age. For a really great writer never falls into a class; he has a marked individuality, and stands alone. But the world has no time to make such distinctions; hence the justice of the financial test: a great writer can now obtain great financial results, and society accepts this credential of his power and respectability.

It must finally be regretfully admitted that women writers have done much to degrade the profession of literature. They do hasty and slipshod work, inaccurate and sentimental, overloaded with adjectives, frescoed all over with purple patches of what they consider fine writing. But this is a venial fault; where they chiefly offend is in making love the all-important and absorbing passion of life. Their stories teach too often that a girl has an absolute right to the fool of her choice, though she has to break every holy domestic tie to gratify herself. Further, Florence Layard accuses them of being the translators of the lowest and most sensual French novels, though they gain by this dirty work only the smallest and most precarious of incomes. Is the world much to blame if it gives some of the odium due to a profession which offers women such opportunities?

But then it is not only literature which is wounded in the house of its reputed friends; all other professions are obliged to suffer in the same way: theology, law, and the faculty of medicine are alike degraded by unworthy members of their fraternities. At this day it is very certain that good writers receive all the attention from the social world they can desire; and if they do not enter society, it is because they do not wish to do so. The day has gone by for either patronage or lionizing. American authors never admitted the superiority of gold; and even in England a Lady Holland would not now find any Tom Moore to snub in public. Good society is emulous of giving honor to whoever has written a good book; and it is not true that either men or women need to suffer socially for having done so.

In fact, the tendency of the very highest society is now to

affect literature. Queens and princes, lords and ladies, are eager not only for the fame, but for the financial results, of literature. For literature no longer starves its professors ; on the contrary, hundreds whom law, theology, and medicine suffer to starve come to literature and are fed.

"All the clever people in society could write books, if they would condescend to do it ;—I could," said a silly little girl, who danced around the first tier of millionaires. It is a pity her opinion is not correct. We might then have some literary dandyism ; beautiful volumes composed between the short and long sentences of fashionable hard labor—prose full of musk and millefleurs, with all the lace and jewelry of style and versification. But this is not likely, because, however clever people may be, it requires something more than "condescension" to write books. It is not enough to think, and to know ; there must be the faculty of utterance, and of a peculiar kind of utterance. Writing comes by art, not by chance. The efforts of chance writers, even if they be clever, are things for editors to lose their sweetest tempers over. Perhaps there may be nothing in writing good books, and people who do not write them may be as intellectual as those who do. Whoever think so, let them try it. As surely as they do, they will find that an amateur book will as certainly betray itself as an amateur attempt to make a dress-coat.

The true writer gives his whole intellect and his whole time to his work, and he is satisfied to do so. He has no time and no interest to spare for tiddledy-winks and donkey parties, nor even for progressive euchre. It does not amuse him to say "so nice," and "so pleasant," and "thanks," fifty times an hour, and to say very little else more sensible. He objects to being made a lion of, to writing his autograph for gushing girls, to playing games he abandoned with his short jacket and school-books. So, then, it is not society which is unappreciative of literature ; in ten cases out of ten it is literature which cannot fold itself small enough for society. For in spite of all controversy, it is a great thing to influence public opinion, to inform the ignorant, to solace the unhappy, and to give to unknown multitudes a high, and pure enjoyment.

"For many can talk, and more can fight,
But few give myriads of hearts delight."

ANELIA E. BARR.

THE ART OF MAGIC.

BY CHEVALIER HERRMANN.

I HAVE been requested to lay before the readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW such of my reflections upon the art of magic or prestidigitation as I may deem worthy of note, drawn from a continuous experience of thirty years in practising that art. My travels in connection therewith have led me into nearly every part of the habitable world.

Prestidigitation is sleight-of-hand manipulation, pure and simple, whether evolved from mechanical, chemical, or scientific devices, or produced by dexterity that baffles vision because motion is quicker than sight. The magician depends for the success of his art upon the credulity of the people. Whatever mystifies, excites curiosity; whatever in turn baffles this curiosity, works the marvellous.

Of course human ignorance is no longer a source of profit to the magician, as it was in the days of the diviner, the oracle, and the soothsayer. Few believe nowadays that the magician claims any supernatural aid. I will scarcely be believed, therefore, when I tell my readers that in a few cities in Italy and Spain in which I have performed hundreds came to see me as a curiosity, impressed with the belief that for the power he gave me I had made a compact with the devil for the delivery of my soul. In these cities I have seen people reverently cross themselves when I was passing.

To what folly ignorance could once go on this point is best illustrated by quoting the King James statute against witchcraft. It was a supplement to the milder enactments against the same felony instituted during the reign of Elizabeth:—

“If any person shall use, practise, or exercise any invocation or conjuration of any evil and wicked spirit, or shall consult, covenant with, entertain, employ, feed, or reward any evil and wicked spirit to or for any intent and purpose, or take up any dead man, woman, or child out of their grave,

or the skin, bone, or any part of any dead person, to be used in any manner of witchcraft, sorcery, or enchantment, whereby any person shall be killed, destroyed, wasted, consumed, pined, or harmed in his or her body, or any part thereof, that then every such offender, their aiders, abettors, and counselors shall suffer the pains of death."

Upon this statute many innocent persons were condemned and executed with scarcely the formality of a trial, so great was the reaction engendered against what the very ignorance of the times had begotten and cultivated. This bloodthirsty statute was the basis of the persecution of so-called witches in New England, and its absurdity was acknowledged in the year 1736 by its abolition in England by a law enacting that no capital prosecution should for the future take place for conjuration, sorcery, and enchantment, and to protect the gullible from being swindled by card-readers professing to foretell the occurrence of future events, by providing for their punishment as common nuisances.

Asia even more than Egypt is the land of secrecy. In all other lands wisdom seeks diffusion; there it is valued for its rarity. Its very language is enigmas, figures, and ambiguity, producing perplexity rather than instruction. Time was when the student of prestidigitation aspiring to fame in his art did not consider his education complete without a visit to India. But this is no longer necessary. The very secretiveness of the East Indian juggler, and his lack of communication with others of his art elsewhere, have lost him the prestige he once commanded. Whatever was wrested from him by close observation has been wonderfully improved upon. He has gone on in the performance of the same old tricks by the same old devices, transmitted from father to son and from generation to generation. The elder magicians soon learned that the first business of the East Indian juggler was to act upon the passions by the excitement of awe and fear in the spectators. Impressionable natives were easily subject to these passions, and while filled with them by the handling of snakes or cimeters by the juggler, it was easy to distract attention and, by manipulation too rapid to be followed by the unpractised eye, to produce phenomena unanticipated and that could not be accounted for. A European magician could not count on the excitement of the same passions on the part of his audience as a preliminary step in the performance of his tricks; and yet he has duplicated every trick of the Oriental and improved upon it.

I discovered this state of things on my first visit to India. I longed to visit this home of magicians. I was disappointed—disagreeably so. Many of the wonders of Hindoo jugglery that I had read about were but the grossly exaggerated tales of travellers. That famous trick, related by nearly every writer on Hindoo jugglery, of youths tossing balls of twine in the air and climbing up on them out of sight, I did not see, nor could I find during my visit any well-authenticated evidence that it was ever done. The tricks I saw I could have imitated with little preparation. I would not presume to introduce them upon the stage.

On my first evening at Bombay a troupe of these jugglers appeared upon the plaza in front of the hotel at which I was staying. They were fantastically dressed and painted, and drew a crowd by beating the tom-tom. After a short address by the leader, one of them produced an empty flower-pot, which he filled with earth and moistened with water, dropping a few mango seeds into the pot during the process. He covered the flower-pot with a large piece of cloth and rested it on a tripod of bamboo sticks. He addressed a few remarks to the spectators, and then walked slowly around the covered pot, dexterously allowing his robes to envelop it at each turn, while his followers sang a howling song of incantation. After three minutes of these proceedings he silenced his choristers, removed the cloth from the pot, and there was disclosed in it a mango-tree about three feet in height, which had apparently grown since planting the seed. He performed the trick by removing the pot beneath the cloth, and substituting the mango, which was concealed in his robe, and this he did rather clumsily while he let the robe rest for a moment, as if by accident, over the covered flower-pot previously displayed.

The basket trick was then performed, even more clumsily than the other. This trick consists in placing a boy in a covered basket and piercing it with swords which are exhibited all bloody, apparently having stabbed the boy to death, while the boy, unharmed, appears, coming from another part of the enclosure. This trick would scarcely be worth repeating anywhere to-day; yet the Hindoo juggler is content to exhibit it. The most clever trick I saw in India was done by a native with a cobra. The native wore no clothing save a clout. The cobra he deposited on the sand and covered with a cloth. He then began a series of incanta-

tions, which invariably accompany the performance of every trick, around the covered reptile, using his hands and arms in endless gesticulation. At last he snatched away the cloth. The snake had vanished, seemingly "into thin air," but in reality into the clout about the native's loins. During the gesticulations he had barely touched the cloth,—the signal for the cobra, which was trained,—and, bending for a moment so that the clout would fall into a fold, the snake leaped into it so quickly that the movement was unobserved. So little was I impressed with East Indian jugglery that I did not deem it a paying investment to incur the expense or labor of securing the most clever of the juggler's assistants.

The magicians of Europe, beginning with Houdin and Cagliostro, have given a great impetus to their art. I regard the magicians of to-day as the best the world has ever produced. The perfection of mechanical contrivances and the possibilities of electricity and chemistry have been wonderful helps in the exercise of the so-called black art. It is well for the magician that such is the case, for the demands upon him for novelty were never greater. I find the spectators at this species of entertainment more numerous and more interested than those of thirty years ago. How to entertain them leads up to the other question, What are the requisites and qualifications of the magician?

I could answer the question by a negative definition of what the magician should not be better than to state positively what his art should make him. No one regards the magician to-day as other than an ordinary man gifted with no extraordinary powers. The spectators come, not to be impressed with awe, but fully aware that his causes and effects are natural. They come rather as a guessing committee, to spy out the methods with which he mystifies. Hundreds of eyes are upon him. Men with more knowledge of the sciences than he come to trip and expose him, and to baffle their scrutiny is the study of his life. Long years of training and exercise alone will not make a magician. I could name a hundred men with these qualifications, who started out in the practice of legerdemain within the past thirty years, not one of whom is known now. There must be some natural aptitude for the art; it must be born in a man, and can never be acquired by rule. He must be alert both in body and in mind; cool and calculating to the movement of a muscle under all cir-

cumstances ; a close student of men and human nature. To these qualifications he must add the rather incongruous quality of a mind turning on contradictions. With a scientific cause he must produce a seemingly opposite effect to that warranted by order and system.

I know of no life requiring such a series of opposite qualities as the magician's. And after the exercise of all these qualities I have named, resulting in the production of the most startling and novel results, the magician has not the satisfaction, like other men, of the enjoyment of his own product. He must be prepared to see it copied by others, or after a short time discovered by the public. Hence the magician must be an inventor, mechanical and scientific. Think of the time, thought, and weary labor given to the production of such tricks as the "cabinet mystery" of the Davenport, the "sealed tent" of the Eddys, the reading of letters in gummed envelopes, and the "second sight" of Houdin. All these are perplexing in their ingenuity, even after the methods of their performance are known.

Again, so great are the demands of the public upon the magician that he can no longer use the machinery and mechanical contrivances of his own invention with which he cumbered the stage formerly. For the most part he must perform his wonders with his contrivances so reduced as to be invisible. Formerly he could extract his birds from bags and covered cages, his flowers and fruits from friendly and unsuspecting-looking tables, and his live animals from confederates. Now he must produce all these things from the coats and pockets of the spectators.

I have not drawn a very rosy picture of the magician. I did not intend to do so. To the novice entering the life and promising himself ease, indolence, and wealth, I should say, "Don't !"

I have often been asked if the pursuit I follow does not become monotonous. By no means. There is an ever-recurring novelty in the life. Even if the tricks performed admitted of only one method instead of a dozen in their performance, there are the same puzzled lookers-on, wondering, tricked, and baffled through the most simple and natural causes. The magician controls them as potently as the orator controls his audience, and the enjoyment of his power is even greater. Monotonous ? Never ! The life of the magician is one of almost infinite variety.

If I were asked to designate any one particular illusion as the most brilliant I know, I should unhesitatingly mention that of the vanishing lady, invented by Buatier de Kolta. Its very success was its ruin, so transcendent was it in mystification. The effect of the trick upon the spectator, the first time he sees it, is nothing short of marvellous. The performer brings forward a lady to the front of the stage, seats her upon a chair in full view of the spectators, spreads over her a piece of filmy silk, so gauzy that the outlines of her figure may be discerned through it, and while she is in this position he whisks off the silk. The chair is there; the lady has vanished.

The explanatory details of this wonderful trick, which are now known by every tyro in the profession, would weary rather than instruct. I have often experimented with the trick myself as a curiosity. Suffice it to say that the elaborate mechanical operations necessary for its production would almost build a locomotive, and yet they are exhausted in a hundred springs and bolts of steel working like the springs of a watch and all coöperating, with the aid of a confederate working through a trap-door under the stage.

People have repeatedly asked me which of my tricks have pleased me the most, and which I take the most delight in performing. Naturally the effort that brings the greatest success is regarded by a man his best. I consider the trick of restoring the shattered mirror as my most famous one. This I had the honor of performing before the Czar of Russia upon an invitation to give an exhibition at his court. It was done unexpectedly to the spectators, and was not down on the regular bill. While playing billiards with the attachés of the court after the performance, the Czar being present in the saloon, I shot a ball with all my strength against a plate-glass mirror extending from floor to ceiling. It was shattered into fifty pieces. Consternation was depicted on every countenance; on none more plainly than my own.

While the Czar courteously waived my apology, considering the destruction of the mirror as trifling, and ordered the game to proceed, I could easily see that my supposed awkwardness made a disagreeable impression. With the Czar's permission I examined the mirror to estimate the damage done and the possibility of repairing it. While so engaged one of the suite playfully challenged

me to exercise my art and make the mirror whole again, never dreaming that his challenge was the very cue I wanted, and not considering the successful acceptance of it as possible. I hesitated an instant, and then ordered the mirror to be covered with a cloth entirely concealing it from view. On the removal of the cloth, after ten minutes, the mirror was found without a flaw, and as perfect as before the damage.

I will leave it to my readers' imagination to decide how this trick was done.

A. HERRMANN.

THE THEOLOGICAL CRISIS.

BY THE REV. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D., PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE church of Jesus Christ was established on the day of Pentecost by the advent of the divine Spirit in theophany. The divine Spirit came in fulfilment of the promise of the Messiah himself. "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. . . . Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth."—(John xvi., 7, 13.) The divine Spirit came in order to remain in the church as the counsellor and guide during the entire Messianic age until the second advent of the Son of God. Accordingly when the Christian Church in all lands and in all ages has expressed its faith "in the Holy Spirit," it has thereby confessed his presence and divine guidance in the church. All that wonderful advance in Christian life and doctrine that transformed the ancient civilizations, conquered Celtic, Germanic, and Slavonic races, and made Christianity the religion of the world, is an evidence of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.

Progress in doctrine and life is a necessary experience of a living church; and that progress will never cease until the church attains its goal in the knowledge of all the truth, in a holiness reflecting the purity and excellence of Jesus Christ, and in a transformed and glorified world.

Those holy men who were guided by the divine Spirit to found the Christian Church and build the first layers of its superstructure, have given sacred writings which must ever remain the rule of faith and life. Holy Scripture presents the ideal towards which the church ever aims with earnest strivings. The Holy Spirit guides the church in its appropriation of Holy Scripture, and this is ever a progressive knowing and a progressive practice, for Christian knowledge cannot advance far beyond Christian life.

I.—THE ADVANCE OF THE CHURCH.

Progress has always been confronted by conservatives and re-

actionaries. Jesus and Paul had a life-long struggle with Pharisees. Every advance in Christian doctrine and the holy life has cost the heroic leaders agony and blood. But the advance has been made in spite of every opposition. The conservative and the progressive forces are in perpetual conflict. They wage a war that will reach its end only in the last triumph of Christ.

The progress of the church is registered in symbolical books, liturgies, creeds, and canons of order and discipline. If the church had submitted itself to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, it is possible that its progress would have been normal and its decisions would have been infallible. But in fact human forces have obstructed the free development of Christian doctrine and life. Human passion and strife, violence, oppression, and crime have too often given shape and color to the decisions of Christian synods and councils; and therefore their decisions have mingled God's truth with human errors. We cannot rest with confidence upon the decrees of any ecclesiastical assembly.

"All synods and councils since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred. Therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice; but to be used as a help in both."—(West. Conf., XXXI., 4.)

The ancient controversies that separated the Oriental churches and then the Greek Church from the Latin Church were intensified by human passion and ambition. In all these controversies the doctrinal statements of the Latin Church were real advances in theology; but the unchristian conduct of the leaders of the church brought on those unfortunate divisions which not only sacrificed the unity of the church, but also gave Islam an easy victory over a distracted Christendom, and well-nigh yielded the supremacy of the world.

The Latin Church was in throes of reformation for many generations before Luther and Zwingli. The stubborn resistance to the reforming spirit broke the Latin Church into pieces, and resulted in the formation of a number of national churches over against the Church of Rome. These all defined their position in symbols of faith in antagonism with all other parties. The three great principles of the Protestant Reformation were: 1, the authority of the Scriptures is supreme over the authority of the church; 2. men are justified by faith in Jesus Christ, and not by good works prescribed by the church; 3, men are saved by divine grace,

and not by magical rites and ceremonies. These great principles of the Reformation gave new shape and color to all other Christian doctrines that were looked at from the new point of view.

The Reformers were men of great intellectual and moral vigor. Their doctrines were the expression of their Christian life and experience. But they were succeeded by lesser men who gave their energies to the construction of systems of dogma. These soon enveloped the principles of the Reformation in a cloud of speculations and established a Protestant scholasticism, ecclesiasticism, and ritualism which seemed to earnest men little better than that which the Reformers had cast aside. Accordingly a second reformation arose in Great Britain in the form of Puritanism, which reaffirmed and sharpened the principles of the Reformation and advanced towards a holy doctrine, a holy discipline, and a holy life. The Puritan Reformation passed over to the Continent in the form of Pietism and transformed the churches of Germany and Holland; but in Great Britain the Puritan became puritanical, and the choicest youth, driven from the British universities and educated in Switzerland and Holland, returned with a scholastic theology which soon took the place of the principles of Puritanism.

A third reforming movement arose with Whitefield, Wesley, Edwards, and others, and the doctrine of regeneration and Christian experience became the prominent features of the new advance. But this regenerating force ere long became hardened into a cold and barren evangelicalism.

All of these movements were due to the reviving influences of the divine Spirit, and each of them made marked advance in Christian theology and Christian life. Each advance, however, carried with it only a section of the church, so that the Christian Church of our day, in its divisions, represents every stage of progress since the apostolic times. This should lead to the reflection that these advances, however important in themselves, have not been sufficiently comprehensive and essential to embrace the whole of Christendom. The great verities of the Christian religion are in the Nicene and the Apostles' creeds, wherein there is concord. We stand upon the heights of the last of these great movements of Christendom. We accept all that has been gained in them all. But we recognize that each one of them in turn became exhausted and hardened and stereotyped in a dead orthodoxy, owing to

the reacting influences of conservatism and traditionalism. What is the gain if you substitute, first, Protestant tradition for Roman Catholic, and then Puritan for Protestant, and finally Evangelical for Puritan? The advance is in the principles and in the essential features of the movements. We must distinguish between the essential and the non-essential. As soon as we do this, we see Christendom rising in a pyramid of grace, encompassed by tombs of dead theories and parties, and dreary wastes of human speculation; and we discern that there is but one platform for Christendom—the common consent in the Nicene and the Apostles' creeds. All else is in the sphere of Christian liberty. As Isaac Taylor once said:

“But thus it is, and ever has been, that those who are sent by heaven to bring about great and necessary movements, which, however, are, after a time, either to subside, or to fall into a larger orbit, are left to the short-sightedness of their own minds in fastening upon their work some appendage (perhaps unobserved) which, after a cycle of revolutions, must secure the accomplishment of heaven's own purpose—the stopping of that movement. Religious singularities are heaven's brand, imprinted by the unknowing hand of man, upon whatever is destined to last its season, and to disappear.”—(“Wesley and Methodism,” p. 81.)

We have reached a period in which all the great movements have spent their force, and there are that confusion, agitation, and perplexity which indicate the birth of a new movement that will absorb, comprehend, and carry to loftier heights all that have preceded it. When all the *isms* have been broken off, the jagged edges of controversies will disappear, and Christian parties will fuse into a common brotherhood.

II.—THE REAL ISSUE.

No one can understand the issues involved in the present theological crisis unless he distinguish three things: 1, the doctrine of Holy Scripture; 2, the doctrine of the creeds; 3, traditional dogma. In the evolution of Christian theology the constant tendency is to overlay Scripture and creed with tradition. Every reforming movement must strip off the traditional dogmas from the Scriptures and present the genuine achievement of the church as expressed in its official symbols apart from speculative elaborations. This is the real issue at the present time. There is a rally of dogmaticians and traditionalists against those Biblical and historical scholars who are aiming to dethrone tradi-

tion and put Holy Scripture and the creeds in their proper position of authority in the church.

It must be evident to every thinking man that the traditional dogma has been battling against philosophy and science, history and literature, and every form of human learning. In this battle the Bible and the creeds have been used in the interests of this dogma, and they and the church have been compromised thereby. It is of vast importance, therefore, to rescue the Bible and the creeds from the dogmaticians. There can be little doubt that the traditional dogma is doomed. Shall it be allowed to drag down into perdition with it the Bible and the creeds? The dogmaticians claim that their dogma is in the creed; if we do not submit to it, we must leave the church. They insist that their dogma is in the Bible, and if we do not accept it, we must give up the Bible. Biblical scholars and historical students propose to do neither of these things; on the contrary, to hold up the Bible as the supreme authority for the church; to build on the creeds as the ecclesiastical test of orthodoxy. Traditional dogma is a usurper, and it will be dethroned from its last stronghold in the Presbyterian Church.

Traditional dogma in the Presbyterian Church is chiefly the scholastic Calvinism of the seventeenth century of Switzerland and Holland, mingled with elements from British Evangelicalism of the eighteenth century. But alongside of it is an apologetic based upon the Arminianism of Bishop Butler and an ethical philosophy of the nineteenth century. It is this internal strife between Calvinistic dogma, Arminian apologetics, and rationalistic ethics that has brought on the crisis in the Congregational and Presbyterian churches. Calvinistic dogma has been well-nigh eliminated from the Congregational churches. In the Presbyterian Church semi-Arminianism demands a revision of the Calvinistic sections of the Westminster Confession. The Calvinistic party in the Episcopal Church is a vanishing quantity. The Baptist churches seem to be strong in their Calvinism, but there are signs of weakness in these also.

But the battle between Calvinism and Arminianism is no longer of any practical importance to the Christian world. The vast majority of Christians have settled down into an intermediate position. It may be important to Presbyterians to change the complexion of the Calvinism of the Westminster Confession, but

such a change will have little or no influence upon the currents of modern theology.

The most important questions of our day are not determined in any of the creeds of the church, and are, therefore, beyond the range of orthodoxy. When the church, in its official organs, decides these questions, then for the first time will they enter into the field of orthodoxy. Theological discussion at the present time is, for the most part, above and beyond the lines of denominational distinctions. All Christian theologians are engaged in them, without regard to sect or calling. They centre about three great topics : the first things—Bible, church, and reason ; the last things—the whole field of eschatology ; and the central thing—the person and work of Jesus Christ.

III.—THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

This was an essential question at the Reformation. It has been a fundamental doctrine ever since. There are three seats of divine authority—the Bible, the church, and the reason. Define Bible, church, and reason as you may, in any case God approaches men through each of them. The Christian Church is divided into three great parties—Evangelicals, Churchmen, and Rationalists. But there are many subdivisions of these parties, and not a few who take intermediate positions. The Churchmen make the church supreme over Bible and reason. The Evangelicals make the Bible supreme over church and reason. The Rationalists make the reason supreme. The conflict between Roman Catholics and Protestants since the Reformation leaves these two great parties in very much the same relative strength as at the close of the sixteenth century. Two hundred years have shown that the one is not to conquer the other. But in the meanwhile the rationalistic party, which had but few adherents in the sixteenth century, has gained from Roman Catholic and Protestant alike. On the continent of Europe, at least, it is well-nigh equal to either of the others. It seems altogether probable that neither party is to yield in the contest ; there must be some way of reconciliation in a higher unity. All earnest men should strive after such a reconciliation. The historian recognizes that men have found God in the Bible, the church, and the reason. If this is so, it is evident that those who use the three media of communication with God,

and use them to the utmost, will be most likely to attain the highest degree of union and communion with God. It is the opinion of Christian scholars that Socrates and pure-minded heathen have ever found God in the forms of the reason. Why should we deny that a modern Rationalist like Martineau, and seekers after God among the people who are fenced off from Bible and church by the exactions of priest and ecclesiastic, find God enthroned in their own hearts? The divine Spirit "worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth" (West. Conf., x., 3); and though he ordinarily works through Bible and church, yet when these channels of divine grace are obstructed by the rags of human dogmatism, or when by the neglect of the ministry they do not reach forth to the weak, the ignorant, and the destitute, the divine Spirit works without them in the enlightening and salvation of men. When I take this position, I do not deny the Protestant position that Holy Scripture is supreme. I simply affirm that, where Holy Scripture does not work as a means of grace, the divine Spirit may work now as he worked before the Bible and the church came into existence.

When I say that Newman and multitudes of Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics, Orientals, and churchmen of every name have found God through the church, I agree with the Reformers in recognizing these as Christians, and I do not deny the supremacy of the Scriptures. Where the Scriptures are withheld from the people by ecclesiastical authority, or where earnest seekers after God are driven from the Bible by the dogmas of traditional orthodoxy, how can the grace of God flow to them through the Scriptures? Those who restrain them from the Bible have the blame of keeping them from this gate of the Kingdom of God. The only ways of access left them are the church and the reason. And if they have not been taught to use the reason as a means of access to God, God's Spirit will make the church an avenue of grace.

It is our contention that each one of the channels of divine grace should be cleared of obstructions; that each one should be made free and open to the use of man. Then, in our opinion, Holy Scripture will rise into acknowledged superiority over them all.

IV.—HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The chief reason why men do not universally recognize the supremacy of Holy Scripture is that the scholastics and tradi-

tionalists have thrust the Scriptures aside, have encased them in speculative dogma, and have used dogmatic theories of the Bible as a wall to fence off earnest, truth-seeking men. We present several of these dogmatic utterances.

"The Presbyterian Church, in unison with all evangelical Christians, teaches that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, having been given by the immediate and plenary inspiration of God, are both in meaning and verbal expression the Word of God to man."

"A proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine, but the Scripture's claims, and therefore its inspiration in making those claims."

"Every book is genuine which was esteemed genuine by those who lived nearest to the time when it was written, and by the ages following, in a continued series."

"So far as the Old Testament is concerned, those books, and those only, which Christ and his Apostles recognized as the written word of God are entitled to be regarded as canonical. . . . The principle on which the canon of the New Testament is determined is equally simple. Those books, and those only, which can be proved to have been written by the Apostles, or to have received their sanction, are to be recognized as of divine authority."

"If, as one asserts, 'the great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names are lost in oblivion,' it was written by uninspired men. . . . This would be the inspiration of indefinite persons like Tom, Dick, and Harry, whom nobody knows, and not of definite historical persons like Moses and David, Matthew and John, chosen by God by name and known to men."

These are specimens of the statements of the dogmaticians of our day, and of the traditional theories of the Bible that prevail among the ministry. They claim that inspiration is *verbal*; the Bible is *inerrant* in every particular; the *traditional* authors of the Biblical books must have written them; the canon accepted by the *primitive* church must be accepted by us. These dogmatic utterances are insisted upon as if they were orthodox, and yet in fact there is not a creed in Christendom that indorses them; there is no Biblical authority for them; they are purely speculations and traditions, without any binding authority whatever. These dogmas confront a scientific study of the Bible.

1. The critical study of the canon shows clearly that the Christian Church has never been in concord on this subject. The Roman Catholic Church follows the broader canon of St. Augustine and the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. Protestants follow the stricter canon of St. Jerome and the Jewish synod of Jamnia. But not a few of the writings of the stricter canon were disputed by Jew and Christian. And the Christian writers of the ante-Nicene age used as Holy

Scripture several writings which are not in the Augustinian canon. The Roman Catholics build their canon on the authority of the living historical church. The Reformers built their canon upon the authority of the divine Spirit speaking in Holy Scripture to the believer.

"We know these books to be canonical and the sure rule of our faith, not so much by the common accord and consent of the church, as by the testimony and inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit, which enables us to distinguish them from the ecclesiastical books."—(Gallican Confession, IV.)

The modern Rationalists test the canon by the reason. But modern Evangelicalism builds not on the judgment of the nineteenth century, but the judgment of the second and third centuries; not on the authority of the living church, but on the authority of the dead church. It has abandoned the internal divine evidence of canonicity, and destroyed the base of Protestantism. It builds on an uncertain, fluctuating tradition, and in that tradition selects the narrower rather than the broader line.

2. Textual criticism destroys the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Language is the vehicle, the dress, of thought. Thought may find expression in any one of a thousand languages; it may be dressed in a great variety of synonymes, phrases, and literary forms, in any highly-developed language. The form may vary indefinitely, and yet the meaning be essentially the same. The divine communication to the prophet's mind, and the inspiration to give it utterance by pen or tongue, does not necessarily carry with it the inspiration of the tongue in its utterances or the pen in its constructions. No creed in Christendom teaches verbal inspiration.

I shall quote a few English Presbyterians of the seventeenth century, who had great influence in the formation of the Puritan faith.

"All language or writing is but the vessel, the symbol, or declaration of the rule, not the rule itself." "For it is not the shell of the words, but the kernel of the matter, which commends itself to the consciences of men, and that is the same in all languages." "The Scripture stands not in *cortice verborum* but in *medulla sensus*; it is the same wine in this vessel which was drawn out of that." "The Scriptures in themselves are a lanthorn rather than a light; they shine indeed, but it is *alieno lumine*; it is not their own, but a borrowed light."*

These are testimonies of Lyford, Poole, Vines, and Wallis, among the most distinguished scholars of their time. They com-

* See Briggs's "Whither?" p. 66. Chas. Scribner's Sons.

pare the words of Scripture to vessels, symbols, shells, wine-glass, lantern. The divine word is in the contents, the rule itself, the kernel, the wine, the light. Textual criticism finds no difficulty with these ancient divines and their doctrine of inspiration, but it casts off the modern dogma of verbal inspiration as the shroud of divine truth, the grave-clothes of the Word of God.

3. The higher or literary criticism on purely scientific principles determines the integrity, authenticity, literary forms, and credibility of the Scriptures. It works with the same rules that are used in every other department of the world's literature. These principles are : 1. The writing must be in accordance with its supposed historic position as to time, place, and circumstances. 2. Differences of style imply differences of experience and age of the same author, or, when sufficiently great, differences of author and period of composition. 3. Differences of opinion and conception imply differences of author when these are sufficiently great, and also differences of period of composition. 4. Citations show the dependence of author upon author, or authors cited. 5. Positive testimony. 6. The argument from silence.* The application of these rules to the scientific study of the Bible has shown that a large part of the traditions as to authorship, date, style, and integrity have no solid ground. As I recently said in my inaugural address :

"Traditionalists are crying out that it is destroying the Bible, because it is exposing their fallacies and follies. It may be regarded as the certain result of the science of the Higher Criticism that Moses did not write the Pentateuch or Job ; Ezra did not write Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah ; Jeremiah did not write Kings or Lamentations ; David did not write the Psalter, but only a few of the Psalms ; Solomon did not write the Song of Songs or Ecclesiastes, and only a portion of the Proverbs ; Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name. The great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names or connection with their writings are lost in oblivion. If this is destroying the Bible, the Bible is destroyed already. But who tells us that these traditional names were the authors of the Bible ? The Bible itself ? The creeds of the Church ? Any reliable, historical testimony ? None of these ! Pure conjectural tradition ! Nothing more !"—"Authority of Holy Scripture," p. 33. Chas. Scribner's Sons.)

Higher criticism cuts up the dogmatic theory of the Bible from the roots. If the traditional dogma be correct, higher criticism, for all who accept its conclusions, has destroyed the inspiration of a large part of the Bible. The dogmaticians and

* See Briggs's "Biblical Study," pp. 87 seq. Chas. Scribner's Sons.

those who follow them must battle with higher criticism in a life-and-death struggle. They have identified Bible and creed with their dogma, and they are risking everything on the issue of the struggle. But higher criticism has no difficulty in dealing with them. We ask them who wrote the orphan Psalms and the Epistle to the Hebrews. They cannot tell us. Are these books to go out of their canon because they were written by "Tom, Dick, and Harry," whom we do not know to be inspired? And even if we could find authors for all the Biblical books, how can we prove the inspiration of the writers except from the books? And yet we are asked to accept these very books because they were written by these inspired men. On such a vicious circle the dogmaticians build their faith.

Higher criticism finds no more difficulty in accepting the inspiration of those great unknown poets who wrote the book of Job and the exilic Isaiah than it does of the prophets Hosea and Micah, respecting whom there is no doubt. The Epistle to the Hebrews is as divine as the Epistle to the Romans; the name of Paul does not add a feather's weight to its authority. We determine the inspiration of the writer from the inspiration of the book, and we determine the inspiration of the book from its internal character and the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in it to the believer. The same Holy Spirit who guided holy men to produce the writings gives assurance to those who use them that they are the Word of God.

"The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God."—(West. Conf., I., 4.)

4. The chief struggle between Biblical criticism and the traditional dogma is about the question of inerrancy. No word of Holy Scripture, no sentence of historic creed, makes this claim for the Bible. It is a theory of modern dogmaticians. Biblical criticism finds errors in Holy Scripture in great numbers. These errors are in the circumstantialia, and not in the essentials. They do not disturb any doctrine; they do not change the faith and life of the Christian Church. The great reformers, Calvin and Luther, recognized errors in the Scriptures; Baxter and Ruthenford were not anxious about them; the greatest theologians of modern Germany, Van Oosterzee, Tholuck, Neander, Stier,

Lange, Dorner, Delitzsch, do not ignore them. Where is the German scholar of any rank who denies them? British scholars such as Sanday, Cheyne, Driver, Gore, Davidson, Bruce, Dods, Blaikie; American scholars such as Schaff, Fisher, Thayer, Harper, Smyth, Evans, H. P. Smith, Francis Brown, and hosts of others, frankly point them out. It may be regarded as the consensus of Biblical scholars that the Bible is not inerrant; and yet the dogmaticians insist that *one* error destroys its inspiration. They battle in death-struggle for their dogma because their Bible shares in its defeat. They risk their whole Bible on a single error. One error in citation, one error in natural history, in astronomy, in geology, in chronology, destroys the whole Bible for them. It is now generally admitted that there are errors in the present text, but it is claimed that the original autographs as they first came from their authors were inerrant. But how can they prove this? It is pure speculation in the interest of their dogma. Criticism does not find the number of errors decreasing; they rather increase as we work our way back in the study of manuscripts, versions, and citations, and advance in the critical analysis of the literature. It discredits the entire work of criticism to speculate as to another text than the best one we can get after the most patient and painstaking study.

Biblical criticism pursues its work in a purely scientific spirit. It will detect, recognize, and point out errors wherever it may find them in Holy Scripture. If the Reformers and Puritans, the great Biblical scholars of the past, have maintained their faith in the Bible notwithstanding the errors they have seen in it, it is improbable that the Biblical critics of our day will be disturbed by them. If any one is disturbed, it will be those who have been misled by the dogmaticians to rest their faith on the doctrine of inerrancy. These will ere long find the doctrine a broken reed that will give them a severe fall and shock to their faith, if it does not pierce them to the heart with the bitter agony of perplexity and doubt.

5. The science of Biblical interpretation has been greatly advanced in our day. This advance has dislodged not a few proof-texts of systems of divinity, and destroyed numberless sermons. This in itself excites the hostility of large numbers of ministers to the newer exegesis.

6. The improvement in Biblical history, with its helps, Biblical geography, archæology, natural history, has changed the face of Biblical study.

V.—BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

The most important department of recent Biblical science is Biblical theology. Biblical theology rests upon Biblical criticism. It has to determine the theology of each document by itself, then to compare the theologies of the documents and ascertain those things in which they agree and those in which they differ. This work proceeds through the entire Bible, until at length the unity and variety of Holy Scripture is discerned and then set forth in its entirety. Biblical theology traces the development of every doctrine, every form of religion, and every phase of morals. Nothing is overlooked that is found in the Bible.

Biblical theology is the youngest of the daughters of Biblical science. The writer of this article was, if he mistake not, the first in this country to write upon the subject and to attempt a complete course of lectures upon it.

The study of Biblical theology puts dogmatic theology to a severe test. In Germany it long since forced a reconstruction of dogmatics. The great systematic theologians of our time, such as Dorner, Martensen, Van Oosterzee, Müller, Kahnis, Ritschl, build upon it. But few American dogmaticians have studied it. They persist in methods, lines of argumentation, and a use of proof-texts which have long since been discarded in Europe. The present theological crisis is due largely to the resistance to Biblical theology on the part of the dogmaticians and their pupils, representing the great majority of the ministry, who were trained under the old methods. They have been taught that dogmatic theology is only a systematic expression of the doctrine of the Bible.

But Biblical theology makes it clear that these systems are chiefly speculative, and that, if they were reduced to their Biblical dimensions, their authors would hardly recognize them. Like a big orange, with thick skin and a mass of pulp, they yield little juice. These dogmatic systems neglect large masses of Holy Scripture; they depreciate some Biblical doctrines of great importance and exaggerate others of little importance, and so the whole face of Biblical doctrine is changed. Let any one study the proof-texts in the indexes of the favorite systems of dogma used in America, and he will at once see the significance of what

has been said. There is a capricious use of the Bible which is the reverse of systematic. There is a piling-up of huge masses of dogma on a few innocent texts, and a brief mention of those comprehensive Biblical statements such as Luther named little Bibles. I yield to no one in admiration of a true systematic theology such as those attempted by Henry B. Smith and Isaac A. Dorner, Martensen, Kahnis, and Van Oosterzee. These theologians aim at a complete system built upon philosophy and science, Bible and history, church and creed. But those American dogmatic systems that depreciate the reason and then go to extremes in dogmatic speculation; that ignore Biblical theology and then search the Bible with a lantern for props for their dogmas; that turn their backs on the historical church and institutional Christianity, and then chase every shadow of tradition that may seem to give them support, however feeble,—such systems are but castles in the air, schoolboys' bubbles, the delight of a body of ministers in a period of transition, but without the slightest substantial contribution to the faith and life of the generations to come.

VI.—LAST THINGS.

We have exhausted our space in the study of the first things. We must sketch rapidly the topics that remain. The last things embrace death, the middle state, the resurrection, and the Messianic judgment with its rewards and penalties. The Reformers rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, but did not state a Protestant doctrine of the middle state. They concentrated their attention upon justification by faith at the beginning of the Christian life; they did not unfold the whole doctrine of redemption. The field of eschatology was left by them in a very obscure condition. They simply maintained the old church doctrine after they had stripped off the Roman Catholic errors. They made no advance at this point. Great changes have taken place in the Christian world since the Reformation. The neglect of infant baptism and church membership by the masses in Christendom, the opening-up of the heathen world in numbers greatly exceeding the nominal Christian world, have compelled earnest men to ask the question how infants can be saved, and how the heathen, any of them, may be redeemed in accordance with the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith. Increased attention to Christian ethics and the doctrine of

sanctification has raised the question how men dying imperfect and unsanctified are to be sanctified. These questions are not answered by the creeds. They have been considered only in a very inadequate way in the traditional dogma. They demand a more thorough investigation and scientific statement. The Christian world is agitated on all these questions, and the theological crisis is largely due to these discussions. There is great need of patience, charity, independent and fearless investigation, while they are in debate. The doctrine of progressive sanctification after death is built on the Bible and the creeds. It is in conflict with traditional dogma, but not with any decision of the historic church. It is a doctrine which lies at the root of purgatory, but is not purgatory. It is a divine discipline, not a human probation. It is in harmony with all the doctrines that have been defined in the creeds. It banishes from the mind the terror of a judgment immediately after death, and the illusion of a magical transformation in the dying hour, and it presents in their stead a heavenly university, a school of grace, an advance in sanctity and glory in the presence of the Messiah and the saintly dead, which is a blessed hope to the living and a consolation to the suffering and the dying.

VII.—THE CHRIST.

Jesus Christ is the pivot of history, the centre of theology, the light and joy of the world. No age has been so intent upon the study of the person, life, and work of Jesus Christ as the present age. The life of Jesus has been the theme of the greatest writers of our day, and yet no theme is so fresh and inspiring. The profoundest theological treatises of the century have used all the powers of the human mind in their efforts to understand and to explain the unique personality of our Redeemer. The traditional dogma unfolded the Christ of the cross and the atonement wrought thereon, but the Christ of the throne and the heavenly mediation have been neglected. Modern Christology is unfolding the humiliation of Christ, the Kenosis of the second person of the trinity, the incarnation, the resurrection, the second advent of our Lord. All these phases of Christology are in course of evolution. They cast a flood of light upon the whole field of theology, and are gradually transforming every other doctrine. As Henry B. Smith well said: "What reformed theology has got to do is to Christologize predestination and decrees; regeneration and sancti-

fication; the doctrine of the church; and the whole of eschatology." There are new difficulties and contests about all these questions. German theology is agitated over the mode of the incarnation—whether it was instantaneous or gradual; over the Kenosis, and the construction of the complex nature of the Redeemer. Anglican theology is agitated with regard to the virgin birth of our Lord and the nature of the resurrection body. Many of the Evangelicals are especially interested in the doctrine of the second advent. Each party is doing its work in the unfolding of some special section of Christianity. American Christianity is backward still in the department of Christology; but ere long it will become the most absorbing, as it is ever the grandest, theme for the Christian Church, and the first things and the last things will be absorbed in the blaze of the glory of the Messiah.

VIII.—THE GAIN.

The fruits of this theological crisis can only be great, lasting, and good. The first things, the sources and foundations of Christianity, will be tested, strengthened, and assured. The living God will approach men who use all the media of divine influence, and grant them union and communion as never before. Vital union with the living God will make living Christians, a living church, and doctrines animated with holy living and doing.

The last things will cease to frighten weak Christians, and stiffen brave men into the rejection of such childish conceptions of the universe as prevail in the traditional dogma. They will become the hope and joy, the comfort and consolation, of manly, heroic Christians ready to do and dare for Christ and his kingdom.

Jesus Christ, in his unique personality, in the wonders of his theanthropic nature, in the comprehension of his work of redemption, will present himself to the consciousness of men as their loving Master and gracious Sovereign, whom to love, serve, and adore will be the bliss of living and dying. "To be well-pleasing to Christ" will be the one end and aim of the Christian world.

It is evident that the evolutions of Christian theology which have brought on the theological crisis are preparing the way for a new Reformation, in which it is probable that all the Christian churches will share; each one, under the influence of the divine Spirit, making its own important contribution to the world-wide movement, whose goal is the unity of the church and the redemption of the world.

C. A. BRIGGS.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

CAN LYING BE JUSTIFIED?

As a matter of cold-blooded ethics, should the truth be proclaimed at the price of life, liberty, and reputation? As a matter of cold-blooded ethics, should the young so be taught, and their elders so set the example?

While all moral advancement of a people must rest upon a proper standard of truth in their intercourse with each other, yet this question has not been squarely met, for even the most truth-loving evade the issue. If the principles of truth *could* be so thoroughly instilled into a race, or a nation, or a generation, that it would be a daily spectacle to see fathers testifying against their children, and children against their parents, and friends against their dearest friends, although their lives, liberties, and reputations were at stake, simply because they were telling the truth, would it be a desirable condition of affairs?

Is there not something in the nature of man that revolts against the spectacle of seeing another jeopardize the life, liberty, or reputation of one he should protect, no matter how much he is a lover of truth? In real life we know absolutely that this law of man's nature has been so well met that it is now conceded in our courts that a wife is not compelled to testify against a husband, nor a husband against a wife, nor is the prisoner at the bar compelled to testify against himself. He is not required to be put to this test of whether he will tell the truth against himself or take refuge in the protection to be found in swearing falsely.

But in daily life this question is not so easily answered: we evade it, and so push away the sense of responsibility we ought to meet. No man, no woman, knows but that some day he or she may be brought face to face with this problem. How to meet it is the question. Have we the right to so answer that the life, liberty, or reputation of a loved one, or a friendless one, or a fugitive who looks to us for protection, shall be taken away, simply that the cold-blooded edicts of truth shall be satisfied? Or is the truth in such a case to be held up aloft in the face of every vicissitude and at every sacrifice?

The literature of a people reflects the ethics of the mind and sentiments common and prevailing among that people, for there the moral purpose and standard should prevail, if anywhere. But upon this subject there is a conflict in our literature. The question is not answered. In the Old Testament the story is told of Rahab, a woman of no character, who concealed the spies of Israel in her house, and, when questioned, swore that they were not there. For this lie she was rewarded. After the destruction of the place she and her

family were protected, and the name of Rahab was handed down to be honored as long as the tribes of Israel should exist. In the New Testament, Ananias and Sapphira swore falsely to save their reputations, and were struck dead.

Walter Scott, in his novel "The Heart of Mid-Lothian," met the question fairly and squarely in the case of Jeanie Deans. Her sister was on trial for her life, suspected of infanticide, though it could not be absolutely proved. Jeanie Deans was called on to testify whether her sister had ever talked to her upon the subject of the coming of the child, or whether she had been seen making any preparation for its reception such as mothers make, which questions, answered in the affirmative, would establish a degree of proof of innocence. The old father stood anxiously awaiting each word, and then turned to Jeanie, not doubting that she would say "Yes," even if it were not true, since her sister's life hung upon her answer. But poor Jeanie burst into tears and replied, "No"; and her sister was sentenced in consequence.

Victor Hugo has met the question fairly and squarely also, but from a point directly opposite. In his masterpiece of "Les Misérables" he presents the picture of the degraded galley-slave, who has robbed the good bishop of his silver plates, and, being captured, is brought back to be confronted by the bishop. The wretch knows that this means the galleys for life, but to his surprise the good bishop says: "Oh! I presented him with these plates. I have been waiting for you to return—you forgot to take the candlesticks also—they are solid silver and will bring you quite a sum." As a result of this lie, the convict becomes an honored man, but the police are still on his trail, and about to take him, when he escapes by means of a room where sits a Sister of Mercy, who tells the police an untruth—she says he did not pass that way. And upon these two lies, one of a bishop, the other of a Sister of Mercy, hangs the character of Jean Valjean, one of the greatest in literature.

In the play of the "Two Orphans," a popular melodrama for the past sixteen years, the persecuted Henriette is sentenced to a convict colony in Cayenne. As the officer enters the prison to point out the convicts who are to be shipped away, a Sister of Mercy enables her to escape by the simple act of nodding "No" as he points to Henriette. And as an evidence of popular feeling on this subject there is always a great burst of applause at this point—applause for the lie which gives Henriette her freedom.

In the day of slavery, in pursuance of the system of what was called "The Underground Railway," each truthful answer to the slave-drivers in search of their victims resulted in the capture of the hapless fugitive, and the condemning of him again to the lash of slavery. Question: Was the truth commendable under such circumstances? and should the youth of our land be so taught?

There is a well-known story of a daughter of Revolutionary times who hid a prisoner of war under the linen she was bleaching, and allowed the pursuing British to think he had passed on, and thus saved his life. The fact that she equivocated with the truth has no bearing on the question. A lie with the lips and a lie by silence each has the same intent to deceive. Practically there is no difference, for it often happens that half a truth, unmodified, is a lie. The question is, "Was she justified, or should her course be condemned? Was it heroic, or was it wrong?"

A popular saying which bears on this subject has sprung into existence, and, showing its popularity, has travelled to the western coast of America from England in the last few years. It serves as a moral standard regarding truth being spoken at the price of reputation. The Prince of Wales was

called upon to testify against a woman's character, and a feeling of respect is aroused by the commendation "that he perjured himself like a gentleman"!

Is there a higher law than the law? Is there an ethical point beyond pure ethics, that human nature feels intuitively this peculiar sense of heroism in telling what is not strictly true in order to save life, liberty, and reputation? Or is life a small thing, and liberty a small thing, and reputation a small thing to place beside the truth?

Ought all things, even a mother's love, and a wife's devotion, and a sister's honor, to be sacrificed to preserve the truth intact?

ELLA STERLING CUMMINS.

TO WOMEN NOT DUMB.

FROM the very nature of her life, interests, social up-bringing, and social atmosphere, woman is the sex that everlastingly shows the least moral and intellectual responsibility about the use of language. It sometimes seems as if any conscience or understanding of the value of words, and of what a phrase means or does not mean, is not to be found in the sex. A word is a short cut to expressing an idea. Women dash for it involuntarily, with as little premeditation as they dart through the first gap in the hedge, with flying skirts, if a red cow looks at them attentively in crossing the field. Men have to consider consequences in words and sentences; men have to reflect, even in a twinkling, that *yea* is *yea* and *nay* is *nay*, and that a blow from the shoulder or the payment of a check is a material consequence of what and how a thing is talked over with somebody else.

But woman, incorrigible, heedless, talky, injudicious, and indiscriminate woman! what shall be done with you?—you irritating, delightful, perfectly irresponsible creature in your use of adjectives and qualifying clauses, whether you are describing how you missed a train, or enjoyed a ball, or saw a street fight! Have you no conscience in your picturesque loquacity? Do you wish to go on exaggerating, *ly*—yes, lying, misrepresenting facts, in your charming desire to tell your own story in your own way? Will no god of accuracy cry, "Hold, enough," and stop you in your mad career, and either at one fell swoop reduce your vocabulary to one of laconic sort or else enlighten you as to the truth that words are the great disguisers of what we have known and seen and felt?

O women! you who are not dumb, nor (if you can possibly help it) taciturn and reticent, miserly of talk! refer the question back to fundamental principles. If you have really, at the bottom of your heart, the wish to do things honestly, correctly, no matter how trivial the things be, and because truth is lovely, do, for pity's sake, speak accurately, use good English and just phrases. It is so easy, so *very* easy, if you will only think about words and remember that words are ideas, and that one cannot lay aside brains and common-sense with any excuse when talking begins. You cannot push away influence in a sentence's course. You are morally a surety for a story's being told truthfully as to every adjective, accurately as to each phrase, with reasonable precision as to every clause, and in sentences that, furthermore, will bear all the grammatical tests that education in your youth should enable them to sustain.

Now, this does not mean the precisian's and purist's way. It does not kill colloquialism. It means merely thinking a little of *how* you are expressing yourself, and of how honestly you are conveying your facts. Opin-

ion is a fact. Convey it as a fact. The society woman, in particular, has become so inconsiderate a narrator that men are becoming more and more impressed with a woman's clear and accurate phraseology, as the outward and visible sign of a responsible mind behind it. In very young women inaccuracy is pardonable, along with sentimentality, romping, and quick temper. But in the woman long out of school and in the thirties it is intolerable.

Lovely woman, hearken yet again! Do not use sixpenny words when penny ones are your honestest commodity. Avoid the usually false, mischievous word "very," that adds so little to a clause. Do not forget that a sentence you begin must needs have an end. Remember that every time you use a misrepresenting word you are not living up to your moral and intellectual duty, even if you describe only a bonnet.

"But," say you, "it is hard to get into this straight road—all the harder if one has walked out of it long since. I wish I could always say just what I mean to say. But I fear I cannot get to doing it." There is a remedy, my inaccurate sister, a good, simple remedy. Correct yourself sharply, immediately, whenever you lapse from truth to fact and the idea in your heart. Do it at once—even twice—in a sentence. Take back what you have uttered, and substitute the truth; qualify and hedge. After a little of this process—tiresome at first—you will be astonished to find how alert you are growing to expressing things as they should be said. The practice works wonders. You will be transformed, little by little, from an exaggerator to an accurate creature; from a liar to a truth-speaker.

Words are the index to mind, to character. More women are uninteresting and inconsequent to men, more women fail to win men with brains for husbands, because they are indiscriminating speakers, thus arguing indiscriminating minds, than because the hair is caroty, the nose flat, the complexion less ruddy than the cherry, or Worth gowns dear array. Either matrimonially or in any other way estimated, talk is *not* cheap.

E. IRENÆUS STEVENSON.

SELFISHNESS AS A PRESERVATIVE.

SELFISHNESS, which is universally detected, at least in others, is naturally not without advantage to its possessor. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, and remain selfishness. Any one would believe that its advantage would be exclusively material, such as an altruistic person would be ashamed of, and would regard, in any high sense, as a disadvantage. And so it would be, if the conventional moral theories were correct. Unhappily, they are not; many of them, when submitted to the test of human nature, proving unadulteratedly false.

How can selfishness be an advantage even to its practiser? Every one concedes it to be the supreme vice; for it contributes more than any other one thing to the sum of human wretchedness, and retards more than any other the progress of ethical development. Its advantage may be seen in the appearance and quality of the selfish everywhere, if they be carefully and continuously studied.

Select any one of your acquaintances particularly noted for selfishness of a refined sort, and scrutinize him. Is he haggard, careworn, conscience-stricken, as a man concerned only for himself, indifferent to the misery and suffering of his fellows, ought to be? On the contrary, he looks plump, serene, content. Is this but a mask? Is there an invisible canker at his

heart? He wears no mask; he has no canker. He is all that he seems. They who know him best will tell you his temper is ever placid, his mind ever at rest. They cannot but envy his disposition, be the cause what it may. He claims to be a philosopher, to have pondered the aims and outcomes of life, to have adjusted them to the law of his own being. You observe the fortunate result. He is too finely selfish to admit his selfishness and his non-admission reveals his selfishness most.

Women are, as a sex, far less selfish than men; but, when they are selfish, they are apt to be extremely, though speciously, daintily, artistically selfish, and to draw those wholly unlike themselves. Who does not know such women? They are more attractive in appearance than the majority of their sex; being better in health, freer in mind, calmer in spirit. Youth seems to belong to them. At fifty, and more, they do not begin to look their years. Many are actresses, musicians, opera-singers, who attain high fame and excite great enthusiasm. It might be thought that Art, in any form, would demand imagination, sympathy, power of identification with other natures. So it does. But the sympathy is mental, emotional only; it does not reach the soul; it does not last; it soon becomes professional. The power of identification subsides into a trick, a habit, and is ruled by the will. Emotion is one of the thinnest, the most deceptive, of phenomena. It finds its fullest expression in music, which appears to be the most spiritual of the Arts. Music carries him who listens, and responds, beyond the soar of sense, to the very zenith of aspiration. But she who produces it may, apart from the sensuous throb and glow of the moment, be coldly conceited and calculating. How often are musicians, who can make others see the unseen, and believe in the incredible, the most fleshly and self-seeking of mortals!

Emotionalism does not necessarily spring from feeling, in a true sense; it is not seldom compatible with the absence of feeling. She who, on the stage, can force tears from a thousand eyes, who can set even the hearts of belledom and fashion quivering, may not feel the faintest swell from the distant wave of grief. Emotionalism and selfishness are entirely consistent. The one frequently screens and sharpens the other, to make it more effective. Emotional selfishness may waste and destroy those against whom it is directed; but they who generate it are prone to live long and keep young. The tragedies of selfishness are for its dupes; the comedies and crowns are for its inheritors and agents.

Who are the women in social circles that win and hold the most desirable men? Are they the affectionate, the devoted, the generous, the self-sacrificing? Are they not the selfish, the scheming, the ambitious, who preserve themselves fresh and fair; who create their opportunities; who seize their occasions; who sight their possibilities by sedulous, unsparing selfishness? The generous waste themselves physically and mentally in looking after others, in trying to do good, in lifting burthens that are not theirs. They are weary, worn, exhausted, past usefulness, when their selfish sisters, still in their prime, smile pity on them, and go bounding away with the lightness that comes from a shut-up heart and a withered conscience.

Selfish women are inevitably the poorest wives, but generally the best preserved, and most appreciated by their husbands, and other men. They either have no children or but one or two; and these they give over completely to nurses, on the theory that mothers should save themselves for the children's sake. How favorably they compare, or contrast, with the wives to whom marriage is a consecration, or, as they say, a superstition! They

boast that they are not broken down with domestic drudgery, with household vassalage, and instance, in derision, some women who are. They certainly are not. They are supple, active, in superb condition. They appear interesting as specimens, though they may not bear study. Having lavished their time and thought on themselves, they have done it with manifest profit, outwardly at least. They brag of their freedom, and surely they have excess of it, material and moral, and are warranted in saying that they are often supposed to be single. They have, in some cases, cured their husbands of a misplaced affection, or, more frequently, have taught them to expect little by yielding almost nothing. Always they have been the gainers, as they count gain, by the steady pursuit of a well-managed selfishness.

Husbands are gainers in the same way by selfishness; their wives, of course, being unselfish. If they were both alike, there would be no bond; or, if there were a bond, it would speedily be dissolved. Strong attractions exist only between opposites. It is the rule of Nature and Destiny that selfishness draws generosity, and that generosity solicits selfishness. In the allotment of humanity, in which more or less satire is mingled, the good and the bad are oftenest mated. A selfish man gets control of a generous woman, or a generous man falls into the clutches of a selfish woman.

The selfish husband, who is to be found twenty times where the selfish wife is to be found once, is made doubly selfish by his generous partner. She is ever urging him to the course he would unfailingly follow; and he assumes to be self-indulgent for her sake alone. "Poor fellow, he needs this or that; dear man, he requires some change, some relaxation, a little pleasure." This is ever her strain. While he rests, she toils; while he enjoys, she suffers. She adores him, and he neglects her. What a pattern of health, serenity, and egotism he; what a picture of pallor, nervousness, and abasement she! She probably dies, regretting her unfulfilled duty to him; and he discovers a younger woman to enslave, and impose upon, while she lasts. To every selfish man an unbroken line of generous victims is always decreed. He is cheerful, buoyant, provided for, to the end; and the end is usually a felicitous chance, a favor of fortune.

Vulgar, untrained selfishness is rarely dangerous. It repels; is forced back on itself, and catches no lures. But selfishness of the cultivated order, which is the commonest, is commanding, complacent, comfortable. It has an air of saintliness, and the enterprise and conceit of an imp. Seldom does it meet with pain or sorrow. Protected within and without, it goes smoothly and safely to its goal. And its aspect is always calm and propitious; for its insensibility is assured, its hardness guaranteed. Material prosperity attends it, and it cares for none other. Such selfishness is discoverable on all sides; but many perceive it not until it has been pointed out; and then their vision may not be clear. Eulogies greet it often, and monuments are built to its memory. All history bears witness to it, and it is amply illustrated in our contemporaries. One example serves for another; for, with all its variations, it is the same at bottom.

One of the most significant instances of unalloyed, vicious selfishness is that of Marshal de Richelieu, great-nephew of the famous Cardinal. So delicate at birth that he was kept alive, and coddled for months, in a basket of finest wool, he flourished to be a disgrace to his nation, and a stain on humanity. Charming women loved him; noble men honored him; kings advanced him; the fairest fortune attended him; blessings unnumbered steadily dropped into his hands. He died in his ninety-third year, as one

who falls asleep, on the afternoon of a beautiful day, the summer sky bending over him as in benison. His entire career was an apotheosis of selfishness.

The life of Richelieu carries a moral against morality. It is a monstrous sarcasm on accepted ideas of ethics. But who shall say that his entirely unmerited rewards are not representative of natures akin to his and all his kind?

JUNIUS HENRI BROWNE.

MIDDLE-AGED WOMEN.

MIDDLE age embraces the ideally delightful years of life, midway between the chaotic fervors of youth and the calm decline of age. In this entrancing period a woman rejoices in the redundant charms of her mature beauty, in her increasing mental brilliancy, in her enlarging number of deeds accomplished, and of personal experiences, which are like invested capital for conversation.

Young people are apt to regard it as a kind of living burial, for it is forgotten that youth is only the time of acrobatic performance and animal vigor. But middle life can never have the exuberance which properly belongs to it until society rejects the forced necessity of compelling its votaries to be buds, of "coming out"; which is a most abnormal contrivance for having a good time. If buds could only realize that they will not be perfected flowers until they have reached middle life, that innocence and insipidity are not as attractive as knowledge and brilliancy, that manners are a slow process of acquirement, that babbling is not talking, they at least would not give dinner parties until they had gained the art of conversation.

Middle life has, indeed, its terrors as well as its uses and delights, according to individual appropriation of its resources. An unhappy middle-aged woman is only less unhappy than an old woman. The frivolity of existence reaches its height through a selfish, senseless, mawkish, vapid, middle-aged woman. She knows people's histories if they are ignoble; she spends her summers on hotel piazzas, belittling those whom she meets; she adores "Mémoires" calling up the scandal of the past history and the gossip of the present town topics. She appeals to men for their judgment about her investments, as a prelude to would-be intimacy; she avoids any allusion to higher education except thereby to suggest the loss of the domestic arts, of which she knows nothing. She is a social parasite and goes to Europe or Florida to make acquaintances.

There is one curious fact about middle life which is full of significance. Women are less criminal than men, for prostitution and maternity, though differing widely as causes, yet produce a similar effect in lessening crime; but whereas among men the maximum of criminality is about the age of twenty-five, in women it is delayed till nearly thirty-five. In every class of criminals the average age of women is higher than that of men. Among 130 women condemned for murder the average age was thirty-four. In Spain, as women are still domestic, there is little crime among them, while in England, where there is increasing participation of women in affairs outside of the home itself, there has been a steady increase in the proportion of women criminals, until it is now more than one in four, and in reformatory and industrial schools the proportion of girls who go astray is double that of boys. In America crime among women is not at present so well defined; still it points to middle life as its period of fertility.

When we judge of human life as a whole, we say with glad truth that

woman is as good as man, or, if we have been snubbed, we say she is better than man. When a middle-aged woman is but kindly and tedious, she is merely a bore acting as a mental nettle-rash upon the sensitive consciences of her friends, who torment themselves by trying to like her. Yet it is far harder to be tiresome to one's self than to one's friends. An ordinary, amiable person well knows she is stupid, and is always trying to do little kind deeds in extenuation of her unattractive speech or unengaging manners. She offers her usefulness as atonement for her dullness.

We all have the middle-aged friends who make us long visits, and hear our domestic troubles as we unfold to them our theories of what ought to be, their delicacy hiding from us their suspicion that our ideas of perfection are drawn from our personal disappointments. When death enters our households, we cast ourselves upon their strength, and are borne through the crises of sorrow, as they prove themselves shining examples of the use of being average women. Each home needs one.

There is yet another kind of middle-aged woman who emerges from youth. There lurks within her a sweet tenacity of will which bids her embrace every opportunity for improvement. She talks little of what she wants to be, caring most for a sense of proportion in all she does. She studies the mystery of success, and, as she finds that it lies largely in personalities, she imbibes the secret of grace and is full of sympathy for the incompleteness of others. Whether her sphere is large or small, she stamps herself upon it. Her conversation is not of quotations—that dreamy subterfuge for real culture. She does not begin a *tête-à-tête* by talking of Howells's place in literature, nor preface every remark by the mock humility of "it seems to me." She proves her point by apt illustration and takes far-reaching views of every question. She is too keen to avoid sentiment and emotion, as therein lie power and like beauty; she accepts their use as weapons for the conversion of others. She stands equipped for service, and is to us as Comte's priestess of humanity. Ceres and Juno were always over forty; Venus and Proserpine were young and made mistakes.

Evenings are a trying part of middle life. Men go out; women stay at home. Surely there ought to be evening clubs for ladies, to which they could go unattended, where they, too, could play billiards or cards, or read the papers and talk about them. As it is, a boarding-house with a general parlor is more sociable than an elegant drawing-room with only one's self in it.

Middle-aged women are usually more philanthropic than literary, as a genius for literature stamps its clients early, while enthusiasm for humanity is the slow growth of accretion. Nevertheless, too many women in their zeal as workers make their enemies wish they were deaf-mutes instead of queen-bees. At the family meal they talk of the "influence of their sex," the formation of public opinion, and the need of petition, and then wonder why the men have such small appetites. They do "a little business" at afternoon teas, always and forever alert. Yet even philanthropy demands knowledge in its devotees, for, though maternal affection and mending of clothes may largely atone for wisdom in a mother, yet *all* women need *constant* education. The very *salon* which the American woman is always longing to create eludes her unless she knows how to know something. Through her *salon* she hopes to revive her earlier social prestige, or at least to establish friendships with men which shall never descend to flirtations, never exhale themselves in passion, and never consolidate themselves in marriage. To a happily-married woman intimacies with men are but subsidiary causes for enjoy-

ment, but a morbid wife can never venture upon the dangerous slope of platonic affection.

To the married woman of to-day middle life presents peculiar problems. She may be the saddest or the most joyous creature in existence. The pain of middle life is its realization of early mistakes and the perception of their self-perpetuating consequences. Even if there have been no errors, a middle-aged mother, in order to still be successful, must prove her ability for compromise. She may be queen over a house, but not over a home unless she drops all authority and allows the individuality of her grown-up sons and daughters to find an outlet in the home. She must act by suggestion rather than by initiative, often foregoing even the first method, or she will find, as so many do, that her daughters prefer college to home, and that her sons will take bachelor apartments. Even a casual observer must notice the frequency of such suites, which never would be rented by young men if their home were as freely theirs as it is their father's and mother's.

Middle life for an unmarried daughter is often very hard, for she may have no real liberty. A girl at forty ought to have her own choices just as much as if she were married. But mothers want to be solaced and fathers want their daughters "round." While even in the most questioning of homes the son is allowed some liberty, the daughter, as long as she is single, is considered as *belonging* to her parents, instead of having freedom allowed her in her pursuits, beliefs, tastes, and expenditures.

Notwithstanding the restraints of parental affection upon the unmarried and the self-imposed restraint that the married most uncomplainingly accept, middle life still remains the glorious period of life, its working season in plenitude of power. Everywhere rise up the superb hosts of women who are making civilization the product of organized and individual ability. In youth they prepared for middle life. Now they enter it and take glad possession, calling it middle life as long as there is strength to work, with every nerve and muscle trained for service, till they pass from the golden portals of successful work completed into the lambent resting-places of old age.

KATE GANNETT WELLS.

WEeping PUGILISTS.

Ἀνὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς
δακρύνεται.—"Iliad," I. 348.

"THE poor defeated pugilist broke down completely and wept like a baby." A fine little finishing touch to the press report of a famous prize-fight.

Round after round, with the patience of an ox and the grit of a bull-dog, the weaker of the two "giants" stood up, only to be sledge-hammered down again, until it became evident to his most persistent backer that the only thing he possibly could do was to stand up—with no certainty even of that. Then the sponge flew up, and the flood of briny and bloody tears came down.

Poor fellow! His physical pain and exhaustion, the scowling, muttering, swearing disgust of his "friends," who patted his red brawn and bet their sesterces upon his blood, the golden prize so ardently hoped for cut down to a beggarly share in the "gate-money" as the price of his blood and pain, and last, but not least, the loss of the champion's belt with its glittering jewels and its big gold buckle, all together proved too much for him; he broke down and blubbered like a schoolboy, or, in the more touching phrase of the press report, "wept like a baby."

If the report were read by only professional sports, loafers, gamblers, and thieves, there would be little occasion for such an article as the present one, particularly in a literary review; but the prominence given to it in the great daily papers argues a vastly greater and more respectable number of spectators.

Now, the briny drops which thus glisten like a crystal pendant at the end of the reporter's article differentiate the slugger from the rest of mankind with quite as strong demarcation as his bull neck and head, his double joints, and his turgid muscles.

Physical pain, chagrin, financial loss (short of utter ruin), do not often wring tears from the average full-grown man. The soldier (who, by the way, fights where the typical slugger would show a clean pair of heels) endures agony without a trace of tears. The last time *he* wept for any physical cause was when, a lad at school, his brutal fool of a master was "bound to flog him till he cried." In a word, the slugger is one of the most strongly-marked examples of abnormal specialization at the expense of general development that our race affords. With unintended and unconscious pertinency, his backers and friends call him *Boy*, with the name of his city or county prefixed. Outside of his specialty, he is a boy at thirty—a very young and most generally a very bad boy. "Hence these tears." A dissection of his brain would be instructive. A perfect specimen would show arrested cerebral development compensated by abnormal development of the cerebellum. In life he prided himself on his big muscles. They were well enough in their way, but if he had understood physiological science better (he never did pretend to be a "scholar"), he would have set a higher value on the big, thick nape of his neck and the ample base of the skull just above, where resided the tremendous motive power that worked his muscular engine. Externally there is little to distinguish the dog of keenest scent from other dogs, but what wonderful olfactory *ganglia* his cranial dissection discloses!

But the slugger's imperfect cerebral development is no cause of mortification or regret to him. He is serenely unconscious of any intellectual or moral deficiency. The ridiculous adulation lavished upon him on all sides, by prince and pauper alike, even inflates his poor brain with the most absurd notions of his importance. Is not his fame international? Is not his full-length portrait seen everywhere, in every variation of the pugilistic attitude?—even in evening dress, heaven save the mark! Do not his fistic exploits fill more columns, with more startling headlines, in the great newspapers of the world, than the inventions of the mechanical genius, the discoveries of the scientist and the explorer, the most momentous of merely intellectual achievements? What wonder, then, that he should speedily get to looking upon his beastly big fist as of more consequence than all their brains? He thinks we all fall into line to do him honor, you and I with our households. "You may tell the *people*," is the great man's lofty mandate to the obsequious interviewer, "that I am ready to fight the Tuscarora Boy whenever he is ready" to do thus and so. And "the people," who are supposed to have been breathlessly waiting for this all-important announcement, are now supposed to breathe freely once more.

Now, it is of the least public consequence what the slugger, or his trainer, or his backers think; but what of the great public who read these double-headed columns? What, especially, of the boys and girls who see them on the library table and in the reading-room? It is you, O citizens, who make the demand, and you, Messrs. Editors, who supply the demand, that are the

responsible parties. You justify your interest in the prize-ring because you claim that it is the place where is exhibited the most magnificent development of physical manhood, the culmination of virile power, skill, courage, and endurance. And so, as you are many, progressive, and influential, the great daily papers freely devote their long columns to a minute and circumstantial report of each great "mill" as it occurs. For your benefit the presidential contest itself is not more carefully and conscientiously reported than the "great international prize contest between" the two champion human beasts of the world.

The term "beasts" here sounds like invective. It is not so intended. It is used simply in the way of scientific classification. The only part of the slugger that is of the least consequence in the supreme act of his vocation is the beast part of him; the only qualities that count in the slightest degree are those which he shares with one of the beastliest of beasts, the bull-dog, to whose "magnificent courage and endurance" alone his own are inferior. His physique is magnificent indeed, but not the most so among men, as you imply. The bull-dog is far from being the most magnificent among the animals. He is as inferior to the lion as the pugilist is to the great English Tree-Chopper; he is as much below the greyhound or the racehorse as the slugger is below the electric-nerved, finely-fibred college athlete.

A few years ago the writer published a novel in which the motive is artificial selection applied to the human species. What the Duchesse d'Angoulême is among pears, what Maud S. is among horses, the hero is among men.* While attributing to him intellectual and moral supremacy, the author made the mistake of giving him at the same time a physique so pronounced, so aggressive in its size and strength, that it has the unforeseen effect of dwarfing somewhat his more important and more admirable endowments. As one of his fairest critics observes,† he is "somewhat overweighted by his magnificent body. His superb limbs, his satiny skin, his immense black eyes, his thrilling voice, his Titanic appearance, his simple diet, are rather too conspicuous." If such is the effect when physical is associated with corresponding mental and moral excellence, what must it be when there is not even a pretence of the latter?

The favorite euphemism for the slugger is "the gladiator." No! the fist is not a *gladius*. There is something of sublimity, as well as of terror, attaching to the sword, but to the fist—faugh! The *gladius* is terrible, the fist disgusting. Its very terror redeems the *gladius* from vulgarity.

Pugilism was one of the exercises of the ancient *palaestra*, it is true, and, like everything else seen through the centuries, it is softened and refined by the blue haze of classic poetry and romance. The history of the race is the biography of the individual. In the youth of either the physical predominates over the intellectual and moral. Achilles was a great, handsome, passionate boy, brave as a lion, fleet as a deer, pouting, scolding, and shedding floods of angry tears, like any hot-headed, full-blooded lad of fourteen.

Centuries later, a whole nation, and that the most civilized in the world, assembled around its olympic arena like boys around their playground; and the best runner, leaper, or boxer was their hero. As representatives of the adolescent stage of our race, we can look upon their fisticuffs and their tears with charitable judgment as well as with romantic sentiment. But when the apologists for the modern prize-ring commend their clients to our equal con-

* "A Demigod." Harper & Bros. † Julian Hawthorne, in the New York *World*.

sideration and even admiration, it is somewhat as if they should excuse (or praise) a father for fighting, swearing, and blubbering in the street by pointing to his children squabbling and squalling in the nursery.

He "wept like a baby." Poor fellow! One cannot help a twinge of pity for the lachrymose giant sitting there in his pain and ignominy. It is but natural to weep with those who weep. Our pity need not be very keen, however, nor very profound. The source of those briny drops does not lie very deep; they are not the tears that come "like drops of molten iron" from the "strong man in his agony" we have all heard of and, once in a lifetime, seen. *He* does not "cry like a baby."

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

THE FUTURE OF MARRIAGE.

THAT matrimony is falling into disfavor with men and women alike is or is not true. It is, at least, constantly asserted.

From the readily-granted premise that knowledge is more wisely diffused than ever before and that women, in particular, are becoming the cultured as well as the leisure sex, it is hastily assumed that the close communion of taste and sentiment desirable in matrimony is growing more difficult of attainment; that the burdens of supporting a family are beyond the financial means of young men whose exacting tastes demand æsthetic surroundings and costly luxuries; that mothers who have suffered in marriage are teaching their daughters to abhor it; that the self-supporting women, now so large a proportion of the sex, are refusing matrimony. It is not strange that from such assumptions many have concluded that marriage is well-nigh a doomed and dying institution.

It may be—it should be—that in the future marriage will change many of its legal and social characteristics. It has changed much since history began recording human doings. It has changed within the last half-century, sweeping aside barriers of barbarism. No woman in the future—in the golden future for which candid souls hope—will promise to obey her husband, will yield up her property to his exclusive control, and her earnings thereafter, will see vested in him the sole ownership of her children, will assume the attitude of a dependent upon his bounty doled out of the common earnings, or have the reasonable right of divorce denied. But changes of law and custom will adorn and perfect marriage, not destroy it.

The excessive fineness of nerve which is expected to make, and does make, happy marriage difficult is not a necessary result of culture. It is even now less common than is supposed. It was not at all common in the historic periods which have been termed golden. Healthy physical force and abounding vitality, as well as keen wits, shone in the Periclean age in Greece, the Elizabethan in England, the early sixteenth century in Spain. The forces are already at work which will tend to correct these evils. No mightier agency for human good was ever welcomed than the present intelligent interest taken in physical development by both sexes. It is becoming the fashion to be healthy. Walking, the gymnasium, horseback riding, bowling, fencing, are resorted to, and teachers of calisthenic, Swedish, or Delsartean exercises flourish by the hundred where ten years ago they starved by dozens. Dyspepsia is no longer the national disease. The coming of rational dress for women is more slow, but progress can be reported since intelligent women both here and in England have shown how dress can be made more healthful without sacrificing beauty or shocking the conventional.

Exercise and outdoor air will drive away half the megrims which assault women, and with the corset will disappear a good proportion of the rest. The women of 1950 will be better fitted, physically and mentally, for matrimony, maternity, and the enjoyment of life than those of 1850. Our granddaughters will laugh at the spindle waists and hysterical nerves of our grandmothers. If at the same time the revolt against matrimony which certain prophets, peering forth from watch-towers, have discerned or fancied shall impress young men with the necessity, in order to win worthy wives, of living more cleanly and sober lives, abandoning tobacco, drunkenness, and lewd conversation, and studying courtesy and grave thinking, we may well thank those who have warned us, even if unnecessarily.

There is no reason to suppose that self-supporting women—or those usually so-called to distinguish them from wives and homemakers who are not less self-supporting in fact—will in the future refuse matrimony, or that they are doing so now. Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells has noted that the vast army of teachers is continually deserted for matrimony; but to support her theory of the decadence of marriage she assumes that teachers are usually women who love children and wish to have child life about them. The assumption is groundless; it would be as easy to assert, and as difficult to disprove, that teachers love children less than other women, having seen so many of their unlovely traits. But other wage-earners of the gentler sex marry. The servant leaves her employer's kitchen for a husband's meaner one which will be her own. The marrying of typewriters is proverbial. Newspaper women marry newspaper men, and put their desks within eye-shot of each other in the big offices. Doctors of unlike sex marry and divide the patients, the profits, and the work.

Fashion controls affairs the gravest and the gayest. It prescribes the funeral ceremonials. It rules in Cupid's court. Marriage is almost universal among the people who, in other respects, are fashion-leaders. Of a young man in any of our wealthy families these predictions may reasonably be written: He will marry, not too young, a woman of approximately equal rank in life, of healthy body and intelligent mind and some personal beauty. She will bear him children, and the children will be, in the main, sensibly and healthily reared, and they in turn will marry, and thus the family name will be perpetuated and the family possessions held together. It is not probable that any woman marries into a wealthy family without understanding what is expected of her. Parentage is as much a part of matrimony and matrimony as much a matter of course with those born to the gold as with those born to the purple. It is as unlikely that the house of Astor will want an heir as that the throne of England will want a sovereign.

Children as heirs and matrimony for their acquirement are sought even by those whose wealth is not counted by millions. In the aggregate they form a considerable proportion of the people of the United States; they include the leaders of fashion everywhere. We hear that babies are coming to be considered properer pets than pugs. In the richest and the most fashionable society, as well as in the best, this has always been true.

Nor is the member of the great middle class, as to wealth, which includes nine-tenths of our people, likely to be debarred from marriage by inability to meet the financial burdens of that estate. Wages and salaries constantly rise for all classes of service. The prices for the necessities of life as constantly fall. There was never a time when the bare indispensables of life could be procured with so little labor, or when so large a proportion of the

fruits of toil took the shape of luxuries or semi-necessities, as books, pictures, decorations, vacation trips, and the thousand-and-one things which make life more than mere existence. Rent alone remains obstinately high. The proper solution of the rapid-transit problem would, in New York at least, increase the chances of matrimony, morality, and happiness to the average mortal more than ten thousand Cassettes crying evil could decrease them.

The young man who finds himself so wedded to fine clothing, champagne, or water-colors that he cannot afford a wife and children may be pitied, not because he is poor, but because he is foolish. The carpenter or day-laborer in New England two hundred and thirty years ago, earning two or three shillings a day in wages and paying five and sixpence for a bushel of corn, would have made no such selfish and self-cheating choice.

But it is not always because men are selfish that they do not offer themselves in marriage. Many a man is known as a "gay bachelor," whose life, if the truth could be told, is one unwearying struggle to support parents or relatives, and who puts from him the longing for wife and home because he must. Such men, though remaining unmarried, are not likely to lower the ideal of wedded bliss. They are as heroic as those of the other sex whose like renunciation has been the theme of so many edifying tales.

Culture and æsthetic advance, looked upon suspiciously as enemies, promise to be allies of marriage. It is the kernel of æsthetic wisdom to separate the beauty idea from the expense idea. No one need now be ashamed of admiring, possessing, or enjoying something which is cheap and pretty. One apostle of the æsthetic cult tells of furnishing and decorating a room for ten dollars. "Form," says this lawgiver, "costs, and texture costs, but color is cheap. Anybody can have color." The artistic fraternity, rapidly increasing in influence, helps to restore the self-respect of the man with a shallow pocket. There are few studios whose occupants, all professors of the art of beauty, do not without shame avow and exhibit expedients by which they have achieved captivating results in decoration at a minimum of expense. These men and women handle colors, masses, effects. They do not count the threads of their fabrics or turn magnifying glasses upon their rents and patches. Our people—the people upon whom the prophets of evil most base their doleful predictions—have never been farther from hopeless mammon-worship than they are now.

There is one element in human nature and the constitution of society more important than any other consideration or considerations to the future of marriage. That is the noble sentiment of love, too much ignored, ever dominant in the human race, ingrained in the very being of men and women, native to their growth. It will not be educated out of us. It shapes itself to our peculiarities. It is generous in the generous, refined in the refined, strong in the weak, but strongest in the strong. What improves the man improves the lover. What makes the man more fit for life makes him more fit for love. So long as grass grows green and water runs downward to the sea, will men and women share their joys and sorrows, cherish their offspring, and build in happy hope the fabric of their homes. Monasticism, profligacy, extravagance, every force of wrong or pervert right which has run counter to the course of this basic element of human nature, have been worsted in the encounter. The rosy lips of Cupid utter an "everlasting no" to the cry that marriage is a failure. The form of it may change, non-essentials be added or subtracted, but the substance will endure.

JOHN L. HEATON.